



Concordia Theological Monthly



F E B R U A R Y • 1 9 5 1

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F. E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

PAUL M. BRETSCHER, RICHARD R. CAEMMERER,
THEODORE HOYER, FREDERICK E. MAYER, LOUIS J. SIECK

CONTENTS

FOR FEBRUARY 1951

	PAGE
THE PUBLIC MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. <i>H. G. Brueggemann</i>	81
A SHORT HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN <i>E. George Pearce</i>	110
SERMON STUDY ON NUMBERS 21:4-9 FOR JUDICA <i>Walter O. Speckhard</i>	125
BRIEF STUDIES. <i>F. E. Mayer. J. T. Mueller</i>	126
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	134
BOOK REVIEWS	150

Hebrew-English Lexicon. — *Copass, B. A., and Carlson, E. L.*: A Study of the Prophet Micah. "Power by the Spirit." — *Gray, James Comper, and Adams, George M.*: Bible Commentary. — *De Haan, M. R., M. D.*: The Jew and Palestine in Prophecy. — *Karpp, Heinrich*: Probleme Altchristlicher Anthropologie. — *Elert, Werner*: Die Kirche und ihre Dogmengeschichte. — *Gerhard Zerbolt of Zutphen*: The Imitation of Christ. — *McNeill, John T.*: Books of Faith and Power. — *Goodspeed, Edgar J.*: The Apostolic Fathers. An American Translation. — *Pierson, Arthur T.*: Many Infallible Proofs. — *Thiessen, Henry Clarence*: Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology. — *Jowett, J. H., and Meyer, F. B.*: Great Pulpit Masters, Vols. V and VI. — *Buszin, Walter E.*: The Doctrine of the Universal Priesthood and Its Influence Upon the Music of the Lutheran Church. — *Schuessler, Luther A.*: Bach — The Musical Apostle of the Lutheran Church. — *Stalker, James*: The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ. — *Foster, Robert G.*: Marriage and Family Relationships. — *Pelikan, Jaroslav*: From Luther to Kierkegaard. A Study in the History of Theology. — *Vöö, Arthur*: Communism's Challenge to Christianity.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

ynod

re of
, Mo.

HECK

PAGE

81

110

125

126

134

150

f the
lams,
estine
e. —
lt of
and
ution.
: In-
l. B.:
ne of
neran
neran
oster,
uther
Com-

hing
lence

e for
917,
e. B. A.

C

Vo

T

in

do
of
Co
In
Sy
sec
fo

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXII

FEBRUARY 1951

No. 2

The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age

By H. G. BRUEGGEMANN

EDITORIAL PREFACE

In the hope of resolving the points of disagreement relating to the doctrine of the call, the ministry, and the Church, which for a number of years threatened the unity of the constituent bodies of the Synodical Conference, the convention in 1946 appointed an Interim Committee. In 1948 this committee of eight men submitted its findings to the Synodical Conference in a majority and a minority report. The salient section of the majority committee's report, signed by seven men, is as follows:

I

A thorough study of the question of Church and Synod on the basis of Scripture and the Confessions compels us to the following conclusions:

- a. That a congregation is a group of confessing Christians who by God's command regularly assemble for worship (Col. 3:16) and are united for the purpose of maintaining the ministry of the Word in their midst (Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2; 1 Cor. 16:19; Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5 f.; Matt. 18:17; 1 Cor. 11:20 ff.);
- b. That the congregation is the only divinely designated body or unit of the visible Church (1 Cor. 16:19; Matt. 18:17; Acts 20:28);
- c. That the congregation exercises its powers (i. e., calls pastors, uses the Keys, etc.) only by virtue of the believers in it (1 Cor. 3:21; Col. 3:16; Rom. 16:17; Matt. 18:17 f.; John 20:22-23).

II

Synods and other co-operative organizations (pastoral conferences, mission societies, children's friend societies, etc.) may be formed for the purpose of carrying out certain specific commands of the Lord

(Mark 16:16; Matt. 28:19-20) which the individual congregation, because of human weakness and other limitations, may not be able to carry out by itself (Gal. 6:2). But such organizations are an outgrowth of Christian love and Christian liberty. The work so done is both *divinely appointed and God-pleasing* (Matt. 28:19) so long as it does not violate the authority vested by God in the local congregation (e. g., Matt. 18:17 f.).

Synod is not a congregation as defined in Par. I, but an association of such congregations. Synod, therefore, has and exercises only those rights and powers which are delegated to it by the constituent congregations, which, in turn, possess these rights and powers by virtue of the believers in their midst (1 Cor. 3:21; 1 Pet. 2:9).

III

The formation of a congregation or the exercise of its functions does not deprive the individual believer of any of the inherent rights, duties, or privileges of the royal priesthood. However, the Scriptures clearly indicate that these rights may be exercised publicly (i. e., by order and in the name of the congregation, *von Gemeinschafts wegen*) only by authority of the local congregation (Titus 1:5; Matt. 18:17; 1 Cor. 11:24).

IV

God has instituted also the office of the so-called public ministry of the Word. According to Scripture this office is to be clearly distinguished from the general priesthood of all believers:

- a. Since no one may execute this office except he have a proper call thereto (cf. Rom. 10:15; 1 Cor. 12:28-29; Jer. 23:21). . . .
- b. Since a particular aptitude and an exemplary walk of life are required of the incumbents of this office (1 Cor. 12:29; 1 Pet. 5:3; 1 Tim. 3:1-7; Titus 1:6-12).

V

The calling of ministers of the Word is the obligation and sole right of the local congregation (Acts 1:15-26; Acts 14:23). . . .

- A. The obligation to call rests upon the congregation
 - a. by the express will of God that congregations should maintain the ministry of the Word in their midst (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5; Eph. 4:11);
 - b. by the implied will of God, which is evident from the description the Bible furnishes of a Christian congregation and the office of the ministry (1 Cor. 3:21-23; 1 Cor. 4:1-3; Rom. 10:15; Acts 13:2; 14:26; 1 Cor. 9:14);
 - c. by the command of Jesus to preach the Gospel (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15).

- B. The authority and validity of the call stems
 - a. from the universal priesthood of all believers (1 Pet. 2:9; 1 Cor. 3:21-23);
 - b. from the divine institution of the ministry (Acts 20:28; Rom. 1:1-5; Galatians 1; Eph. 4:8; Rom. 15:15-16; 1 Cor. 9:14, 16; Jer. 3:15; 1 Cor. 12:28; 1 Pet. 5:1-2).
- C. In order to expedite the work of the Church, the congregation may delegate its authority and power to call (Acts 13:2). This includes the calling of pastors, missionaries, professors, teachers, etc., who are gifts of God to the Church. When this is done, it is solely by Christian liberty and in accordance with the law of love.
- D. The call may be terminated any time that God removes the gift, or the field, or when the qualifications demanded are no longer met (Eph. 4:11; 1 Tim. 1:7; 5:22; 3:1-15).

According to the author of the minority report the differences are not in doctrines as such, but in application. The pertinent section of the minority report reads as follows:

Some restrict the concept of a divinely instituted church local (the Church of Christ as it appears on earth—*ekklesia*, Matthew 18) to the local congregation and consider all gatherings of believers, groups of Christians beyond the local congregation, such as synods, conferences, etc., a purely human arrangement.

Others find in the descriptive name of church (*ekklesia*, they who are called out) a term which applies with equal propriety to the various groupings into which the Holy Spirit has gathered His believers, local congregations as well as larger groups.

Some restrict the idea of a divinely instituted ministry to the pastorate of a local congregation and consider such offices as teachers, professors, synodical officials, etc., branches of this office without a specific command of God, established in Christian liberty.

Others see in "ministry" a comprehensive term which covers the various special offices with which the ascended Lord has endowed His Church.

Whereas the Interim Committee had been unable to complete its work, the Synodical Conference resolved

"4. That individuals and groups of our Synods be urged prayerfully to restudy the doctrine of the Church, in order to obtain the true Scriptural answer to the questions raised in the reports." (*Proceedings of the Synodical Conference*, 1948, pp. 135—144).

As a contribution to the study suggested by the Synodical Conference we are herewith submitting for careful examination the article on "The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age."—F. E. M.

ADVOCATES of the various types of church polity that prevail in Christendom have endeavored to defend their position by the example of the Apostolic Church, and few denominations have escaped the temptation to regard their particular form of church organization as the original and Apostolic form, but the fact is that ecclesiastical polity during the first century was in a fluid and emergent state, and the evidence advanced for any particular form of church government is inconclusive.

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY AND THE PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS

There can be no question about the fact that there was a public ministry in the Apostolic age and that this ministry was divinely instituted.¹ In Eph. 4:11-12 we read: "He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."²

The duty to proclaim the Gospel, administer the Sacraments, and exercise church discipline is vested in the believers, but this does not eliminate the necessity for a public ministry. It is important to note that the universal priesthood of believers and the public ministry are not identical. That the congregation conferred the office of the ministry upon the individual office-bearers is apparent from the selection of Matthias in Acts 1:15, the choosing of the Seven in Acts 6, the sending of Paul in Acts 13, the election of "the brother" in 2 Cor. 8:18-19, and other instances.³

Since the New Testament speaks of ministers as being chosen by God (Acts 20:28), and also as being chosen by the *ecclesia* (Acts 1:15), it is correct to say with Walther: "The ministry is conferred by God through the congregation." There have been those who have criticized this "*Uebertragungslehre*" by insisting that the public ministry exists as a superior estate or holy order, which is conferred upon God's chosen individuals without the instrumentality of the *ecclesia*.⁴ Men like Stephan, Loehe, Kliefoth, and Grabau in 19th-century Lutheranism represent a view of the ministry which had dangerous hierarchical tendencies. The idea that the ministry is not conferred through the congregation, but is a special office conferred by the Apostles upon their disciples and perpetuated through the rite of ordination, is without support in the New Testament.⁵

ORDINATION

It is difficult to determine the significance of ordination in the Apostolic age. In Titus 1:5 Paul instructs Titus to "ordain" elders in every city, and the word used here (*kathisteemi*) is used also in Acts 6:3, where the choosing of the Seven is described. In the Jerusalem case we know that the Seven were selected by the *ecclesia* and then were "appointed" by the Apostles. Whether the same procedure was followed in Crete cannot be determined. In Acts 14:23 we are informed that Paul and Barnabas "ordained" elders in every church, but the word used here (*cheirotoneoo*) can refer either to election or appointment; and in the only other passage in which it is used in the New Testament, in 2 Cor. 8:19, it refers to selection by the churches. In this connection it might be pointed out that the "laying on of hands" apparently took place in connection with the appointment of officers to the public ministry, but the "laying on of hands" was not used exclusively for this purpose. It was most likely a ceremony of consecration symbolizing the bestowal of spiritual gifts. On the evidence available in the New Testament no dogmatic conclusions can be reached on the nature and the necessity of ordination, and ecclesiastical practice in the matter of ordination must be regarded as an *adiaphoron*. Which workers received the imposition of hands and were appointed or ordained in the Apostolic age no one can say. From Acts 13:2-3, which describes the selection of Barnabas and Paul for a missionary task, we can conclude that ordination was a ceremony of consecration. The words read: "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." If this is a reference to the rite of ordination, as it apparently is, then it would be in the Apostolic tradition to ordain all who are set apart and separated for the work of the public ministry.

THE APOSTOLATE

It is essential for an understanding of church polity in the Apostolic age to understand the place of the Apostles in the constitution of the Early Church. The term "Apostle" is used of the Lord Himself in Heb. 3:1. The twelve disciples chosen by Christ for special service in the Kingdom are given the name "Apostles" by the Lord

(Luke 6:13). St. Paul was an Apostle and vigorously defended his right to this title. But the term is used also of others, even of false apostles. We know that the original Twelve and St. Paul received the apostolate directly from Christ. How many other Apostles there were, and how they qualified for this position in the Church, and what authority they exercised, cannot be determined. In any case, we know that the original Apostles and Paul commanded great respect and authority in the Early Church (Mark 3:14; Acts 5:12-13).⁶

The Apostles were occupied with prayer and the ministry of the Word (Acts 6:4). It was their duty to preach the Gospel (Rom. 15:19). They were stewards of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4:1) and the ministers of the New Testament (2 Cor. 3:6) and the ambassadors of Christ (2 Cor. 5:20).

When our Lord instituted the apostolate, He instituted the ministry of the New Testament (2 Cor. 3:6), or the ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:18). In other words, by instituting the apostolate our Lord instituted the public ministry. There is no evidence in the New Testament that the original authority and power of the first Apostles was perpetuated in their successors, but it can be said that all the other and later ecclesiastical offices that have been known in the Church derive from the original apostolate. Walther says: "With the apostolate the Lord has established in the Church only one office, which embraces all offices of the Church" (Thesis VIII, "On the Ministry").⁷

THE PLACE OF THE PROPHETS IN THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY

The place of the prophets in the constitution of the early public ministry is difficult to determine. That they occupied a prominent and important place in the Apostolic Church is apparent. In Ephesians 4 and 1 Corinthians 12 they are named immediately after the Apostles. In enumerating the gifts that are given to the Church (Romans 12), the Apostle mentions the gift of prophecy first. In Eph. 3:5 it is stated that the Apostles and prophets have been given special revelation by the Spirit, and in the previous chapter (2:20) it is stated that the Church is built on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets.⁸ The fact that the prophets play an important part in the commissioning of Barnabas and Saul, and that they dis-

charged certain responsibilities in connection with the ordination of Timothy (1 Tim. 1:18; 4:14), suggests that they occupied a significant place in the organization of the Early Church.

Paul's discussion of prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14, in which it is described as a gift which all should desire, leads to the conclusion that prophecy was often a function and a gift rather than an office.⁹ However, it cannot be denied that while any individual in the *ecclesia* might be given the gift of prophecy, there were individuals who bore the title "prophet."¹⁰ Whether this was an office or a profession, one cannot say. It is possible that the term was used in the way the term "preacher" is used today, referring sometimes to an office, sometimes to a profession, and sometimes to a talent or gift.

We learn from Acts 15 that preaching was the principal function of the prophets, and this preaching was sometimes in response to special revelations¹¹ and sometimes involved the prediction of future events (Acts 11:28; 21:11). In differentiating between the functions of the prophets and that of the Apostles, it is often assumed that the Apostles were distinguished by their missionary responsibilities and that the prophets originally performed the ministry of preaching in established congregations.¹²

THE MINISTRY OF THE EVANGELISTS

The ministry of the evangelists, mentioned in Ephesians 4 after that of the Apostles and prophets, is referred to in the New Testament in only two other passages. Philip, one of the Seven of Acts 6, is called an evangelist in Acts 21:8. In Paul's Second Letter to Timothy (4:5) we read the words: "Do the work of an evangelist." From this meager evidence it is impossible to give an authoritative definition of the functions of the evangelists. Judging by the activities of Timothy, however, it is probably correct to assume that evangelists were itinerant preachers of the Gospel who acted as delegates of the Apostles and were fellow laborers with them in the establishment of new congregations. Whether the title indicated a formal position, with formal ordination, we do not know.

THE TEACHERS IN THE EARLY CHURCH

There were also individuals in the Apostolic ministry who bore the designation "teacher." In Romans 12 teaching is mentioned as a special gift. In 1 Cor. 12:28 teachers are mentioned after

Apostles and prophets, and in Eph. 4:11 St. Paul, after listing Apostles, prophets, and evangelists refers to "pastors and teachers," which is a twofold designation for the same individuals. The Apostle Paul calls himself a teacher (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11). In Acts 13:1 various individuals are described as "prophets and teachers" at Antioch. In endeavoring to ascertain the function of these individuals and their status in the Early Church, we can perhaps assume that their duty was to instruct and indoctrinate the members of the congregations, and it is not unlikely that their place in the Christian *ecclesia* was comparable to that of the teachers of Israel in the synagogue (Luke 2:46; John 3:10). Whether theirs was an itinerant or a resident ministry cannot be known today, although the reference in Acts 13 suggests that these teachers were associated with the church in Antioch. The following analysis of the status of the teachers involves some element of speculation, but there is nothing in the available evidence to discredit the theory that the work of the teachers complemented that of the prophets and that the teachers were assistants to the prophets in the early years. Later, as the office of prophet became more and more itinerant, the teachers took over the ministry of the Word in the congregation, and functioned as the pastors of the congregation until a permanent local ministry was established. This would explain the phrase "prophets and teachers" in Acts 13, as well as the phrase "pastors and teachers" in Ephesians 4.¹³

THE CHARISMATA

Since teachers, together with prophets and Apostles, are referred to in 1 Corinthians 12 as recipients of spiritual endowments called *charismata*, it may be well at this point in our study to examine the significance of these spiritual gifts. The term is used twice in Paul's Letter to the Romans. In chap. 1:11 he states that it is his desire to impart some *charisma* to the saints at Rome. In chap. 12:6 he says that Christians have *charismata* that differ according to the grace (*charis*) given them; and while he does in this passage refer to endowments that were associated with the public ministry (prophecy, ministry, teaching, exhortation, rulership), he does not refer exclusively to such gifts, but regards the ability to give and to do mercy as *charismata*. In 1 Cor. 1:7 the term is again applied

in a general way to all Christians. "You are not lacking in any *charismata*." Also in 1 Cor. 7:7. In the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians the information is given us (v. 4) that there is a diversity of *charismata*; and while the term is twice associated in this chapter with the ability to heal (vv. 9, 30), the last verse of the chapter indicates that the *charismata* referred to all manner of endowments possessed by the Christians of the congregation.¹⁴

These spiritual endowments are special gifts of grace which God has given to the saints, and presumably in special measure to those who performed the work of the public ministry, but the possession of *charismata* did not distinguish the clergy from the laity. It is entirely possible that those who possessed an exceptional measure of spiritual endowment were chosen for the ministry, but the idea that the ministry of the Apostolic age differed from the later ministry because it was performed by these so-called pneumatics, who occupied their position by virtue of their *charismata*, is unsupported by Scriptural evidence. Moreover, the fact that individuals in the Apostolic age possessed *charismata* which are no longer in evidence in the Church today should lead no one to the conclusion that the bestowal of *charismata* terminated with the first century.

THE TEMPORARY AND THE PERMANENT MINISTRY

The view that the Apostles, evangelists, prophets, and teachers constituted a special charismatic ministry, and that these pneumatics differed in function from the local clergy or office-bearers of the congregation and distinguished the Apostolic age from all future periods of church history,¹⁵ is a view that cannot be defended by Scriptural evidence. There evidently were in the Early Church both resident and itinerant ministers,¹⁶ and there were individuals who in their ministry served the whole *ecclesia* rather than a local Christian community; but it is incorrect to conclude that certain individuals belonged to one ministry and certain others to another. There were Apostles who occupied a local ministry in Antioch.¹⁷ To contend that in the first century "there is a clearly marked separation between two different kinds of ministry, the prophetic and the local," or to say that "the Apostles, prophets, and teachers belonged to the church at large, and not merely to some local congregation," or to conclude that the ministry of the Word was per-

formed exclusively by the Apostles, prophets, and teachers, while other ecclesiastical service was rendered by the local ministry, is to follow a line of reasoning which is based on historical speculation rather than on Scriptural evidence.¹⁸

If a distinction is to be made between the Apostles, prophets, and teachers, and the elders, or bishops, who gradually assumed their functions and duties, it is this that the former constituted a temporary ministry and the latter a permanent ministry. Originally the Apostles, and with them the evangelists, were the leaders of the congregation. (Acts 6:1 f.; 1 Cor. 4:21; 2 Cor. 13:2; Thess. 2:11; 1 Tim. 5:20). It appears from the picture given of the Corinthian situation¹⁹ that the local congregation had at first no authoritative rule other than that provided by the Apostles. This direct supervision of the Apostles or their delegates, the evangelists, was a temporary arrangement, and as soon as circumstances warranted, issued in a permanent ministry.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE PERMANENT LOCAL MINISTRY

How the development took place in the individual Christian community cannot be described in detail, but it is reasonable to suppose that as the *ecclesia* grew larger and the personal supervision of the Apostles necessarily diminished, local brethren were chosen to perform the work of the public ministry. It is probable that these local leaders at first occupied a position subordinate to that of the Apostles, prophets, and teachers, but in the course of time, control of affairs in the congregation passed into their hands. This was a natural development, and St. Paul in his Second Letter to Timothy, as he faces the end of his own ministry, is perhaps referring to this transition when he charges Timothy (chap. 2:2) with the duty of preparing faithful men to carry on the ministry.²⁰

The permanent ministry apparently, and quite naturally, was established at an earlier date in Asia Minor than in the Western churches.²¹ We know that around 50 A.D. elders were chosen in the Eastern churches (Acts 14:23), and seven years later, when Paul wrote to the Corinthians, they apparently were still without a permanent local ministry, although the reference in 1 Cor. 12:28 to "helpers, administrators," is very likely an anticipation of such a ministry and indicates that the necessity for a permanent ministry was already felt.

It is probable that some of the permanent church officers at first performed service to the church which did not directly involve the ministry of the Word;²² and the passage in 1 Tim. 5:17 tells us that certain of these officers confined their activities to ruling and did not labor in "the Word and doctrine" in their official capacity, but eventually these local office-bearers replaced the Apostles, prophets, and teachers altogether. That this development had Apostolic sanction is evident from Paul's statement that bishops must be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3:2), from the approval that he gives to those elders who *did* labor in the Word and doctrine, and from his instructions to them on the matter of heresy (Acts 20: 28-31).

We must not assume that there was an official distinction between ruling elders and teaching elders. The passage in 1 Tim. 5:17, on which this distinction is maintained in certain areas of Protestantism, speaks of two functions within the same office.²³

THE ELDER-BISHOP CONTROVERSY

It might be well at this point to consider the question whether the terms "elder" and "bishop" designated the same office in the Apostolic Church. There are some who maintain that a distinction between them must be made. It has been suggested, for instance, that bishops were individuals chosen from the elders and that while all bishops were elders, not all elders were bishops.²⁴ Hatch of Oxford and Harnack of Berlin contend that the elders and bishops must be distinguished and maintain that the former constituted a council over which the latter presided. Hatch maintained that the presbyters were in charge of church discipline and the bishop, as a kind of superintendent or executive secretary of the congregation, controlled the financial and administrative affairs.²⁵ This viewpoint is based on the theory that church organization was modeled after the prevailing social institutions of the time, but it finds no support in the New Testament writings.

The evidence of Scripture is overwhelmingly in favor of the view that the term "elder" and the term "bishop" originally signified the same office. In Acts 20:17, 28 the elders of Ephesus are called bishops. In Titus 1:5 Paul refers to elders and two verses later used the term "bishop" to describe the same officers. In First

Timothy the terms are used interchangeably (1 Tim. 3:1:7; 5: 5-17). Paul in Phil. 1:1 addresses bishops and deacons and makes no special reference to elders, which again implies that the terms referred to the same individuals and to the same office. This is the view shared by most scholars.²⁶

OTHER APPELLATIONS OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE

These incumbents of the permanent ministry were already in the Apostolic age designated as "pastors." While the term may not have been an official designation, it was a descriptive appellation apparently in common use. The reference in Eph. 4:11 to "pastors and teachers" might be cited here. In Acts 20:28 the pastoral functions are ascribed to the elder-bishop. Peter's reference (1 Pet. 2:25) to Jesus as the divine Shepherd and Bishop implies that the two terms designated the same individual, and again in 1 Pet. 5:1, 2, 4 the eldership is conceived of as a pastorate.

In all probability the term *heegoumenoi* in Heb. 13:7, 17, 24 is also a reference to the same ecclesiastical officers. They are described as individuals who occupied a position of leadership in the *ecclesia*: they "spoke the Word of God"; they "watch over your souls."

Another descriptive title given these officers is the term *proistamenoi* (rulers). When we read in 1 Thess. 5:12 that these individuals labored among the people, admonished them, and supervised congregational life, we are justified in the assumption that these men were the elder-bishops of the *ecclesia* at Thessalonica.²⁷

Whether the term "angels" in Rev. 2:1 is also a reference to these same church officers cannot be determined because the literary style of this book admits the possibility of a symbolic interpretation of the term. Some have held that these "angels" were bishops of the congregation and that the responsibilities given them and the authority vested in them suggest that we have here the first instance of a monarchical episcopate; but others, like Lightfoot, insist that we cannot be certain that the term refers to an actual person.²⁸ The question is important because it is related to the history of the episcopal development in the Church, but a decisive solution to the problem cannot be found.²⁹

It is apparent that in the Apostolic age a uniform nomenclature for church officers had not as yet been established. Knopf is cor-

rect when he says: "In some congregations the old designation *proistamenoï* was retained, in others the same individuals were called *heegoumenoi*, in others they were called pastors, in others presbyters, in others bishops."³⁰

THE PRESBYTERAL COLLEGE

It appears that these officers originally functioned as a group. They are repeatedly referred to in the plural. In Acts 11:30; 15:2; 16:4; etc., the elders at Jerusalem are described as a group. The *ecclesia* at Ephesus was served by a college of elders (Acts 20:17). The use of the plural in Phil. 1:1 tells us that a similar arrangement obtained at Philippi, and in the Letter of James (5:14) the sick are instructed to call for the "elders of the church."

This evidence has led some to the conclusion that the modern arrangement whereby one individual occupies the pastorate of a Christian congregation was unknown in Apostolic times. Lindsay, for instance, says: "There is no trace of one man, one pastor, at the head of any community."³¹ On the other hand, the description of a bishop's (singular!)³² qualifications in the Pastoral Epistles, and particularly the picture of the bishop ruling the congregation as a father rules his household, suggests that the arrangement whereby a single pastor served a particular congregation was not unknown in Apostolic times.

A possible explanation of the difficulty is that the eldership belonged not to the individual congregation, but to the entire *ecclesia* in certain areas.³³ The Christians in Jerusalem, Ephesus, Philippi, Crete, and so on, were originally served by a college of presbyters, some of whom labored in Word and doctrine; but as time went on, multiple congregations within these areas were organized, and it seems likely that these small communities of Christian disciples were then served by a single elder or bishop who was "apt to teach." These individuals, then, belonged to the ministerium of the locality and, at the same time, occupied the pastorate of some individual assembly of Christians. This reconstruction of the situation admittedly involves an element of speculation, but it does not conflict with the New Testament evidence available; and in the light of the post-Apostolic emergence of the diocesan episcopacy, it is certainly tenable from the historical viewpoint.

THE OFFICE OF DEACON

The office of deacon was established by the time the Pastoral Epistles were written. The term "deacon" is used only twice in the New Testament to denote an ecclesiastical office: in Phil. 1:1, where Paul addresses the bishops and deacons, and in 1 Tim. 3:8-13, where Paul describes their qualifications.³⁴

It is commonly assumed that the diaconate as a special office in the Church was instituted with the election of the Seven, described in Acts 6:1-6. However, the Seven are not called "deacons" in Acts 6, and there is good reason to believe that in this chapter we have a description of the original of the presbyterate rather than the diaconate. It is significant that the Book of Acts never refers to deacons, but often refers to elders of the Jerusalem church, and subsequent references to the Seven, after their election, describe them as performing tasks of preaching and teaching which suggest that they were elders rather than deacons in the church. Whether the Seven were the first deacons or the first elders of the *ecclesia* must therefore remain an unsettled question.

In any case, by the time of the writing of the Epistle to the Philippians, the diaconate existed. Together with the bishops, the deacons constitute the recognized ministry of the church. A few years later the Apostle, in his First Epistle to Timothy, outlines the necessary qualifications for this office. They are to be men of steady character, with a sturdy faith, who have survived a period of trial and who are responsible heads of a Christian household. No description of their functions and duties is given. The fact that "aptness to teach" is not listed among the requirements of this office may mean that deacons were not engaged in the ministry of the Word, but in a non-teaching ministry.³⁵ The fact that they are always mentioned with the bishops, and after them, seems to imply that they were assistants to the bishops, and this was in fact the position they occupied in the second century. In First Timothy it is required of the bishop, but not of the deacon, that he be no novice, and we may therefore assume that the deacons were often younger in age or spiritual experience than the elders whom they aided.

THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY

It is possible that First Timothy 3:11 refers to a female diaconate in the Apostolic age. There are those who contend that the "women" referred to in this verse were simply the wives of the deacons and that deaconesses were unknown in the time of Paul.³⁶ The Authorized Version translates *gyneikas* "wives"; so does Luther; so does Goodspeed. Others, like the Revised Standard Version, translate "women." Newport White represents the view of those who believe that this is a reference to a female diaconate. He says, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*: "These are the deaconesses, of whom Phoebe in Romans 16:1 is an example. They performed for the women of the early church the same sort of ministrations that the deacons did for the men."³⁷ Deaconesses, no doubt, served the church in many capacities, and the reference to Phoebe in Rom. 16:1 indicates that women performed a useful ministry in the Apostolic age. We can conclude from 1 Tim. 2:11-12 that if they shared in the public ministry of the Word, their activities were confined to the teaching of women and children.

ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION IN THE FIRST CENTURY

It will be apparent from the foregoing study of ministerial offices in the Apostolic age that in the time of the Apostles offices were created and officers were elected to meet those needs that arose in the changing circumstances of the *ecclesia*.³⁸ No ordinances are prescribed in Scripture which might determine the form in which the public ministry should be constituted, and it was not until a later period that an established church polity emerged. In the Apostolic age we find that the public ministry functioned amid a diversity of ecclesiastical organizations.

Compare, for example, the congregations of Corinth and Jerusalem. In Corinth there is a very noticeable lack of church organization. While the congregation was served by Paul, Timothy, and Silvanus (2 Cor. 1:19), we see from First Corinthians 14 that a church polity governing the ministerial office was in a very rudimentary stage. By way of contrast, we find in Jerusalem at an early date a well-established organization. The official head of the congregation was James, the Lord's brother, and he apparently presided over a council of Apostles and elders, who constituted the govern-

ing body. (Acts 11:30; 15:6; 16:4; etc.) Whether Acts 6 refers to the institution of the presbytery or the diaconate, it also supports the belief that the congregation at Jerusalem was well organized at a very early date.

The light thrown by patristic literature on the labors of St. John and his successors in Asia Minor makes it clear that also among these congregations a permanent and well-organized ministry was established already during the first century.

There were undoubtedly many co-workers of Paul who served in the public ministry in various capacities, but just what their official status was in the embryonic organization of the Early Church cannot be determined. Presumably they were missionaries, organizers, preachers, administrators, and served as the need arose in any capacity that was required for the establishment and the extension of the Kingdom.³⁹

It is unquestionably true that the constitution of the ministry in the Early Church was in a fluid and formative state. Supporting this contention is the fact that some individuals bore several official titles, suggesting that the various duties of the different offices within the church were not as yet clearly defined. Thus Silas is called an apostle in 1 Thess. 2:6; in Acts 15:22 he is described as one of the *beegoumenoi* in Jerusalem; and in Acts 15:32 it is stated that he was a prophet. Peter is both an Apostle and an elder (1 Pet. 5:1). So is John (2 John 1; 3 John 1). St. Paul in 2 Tim. 1:11 calls himself a "preacher (*keeryx*), Apostle, and teacher." In Acts 13 Barnabas is numbered among the prophets and teachers at Antioch, and in the next chapter he is called an apostle (14:14). Philip, according to Acts 6, was an elder (deacon?); according to Acts 21, he was an evangelist.⁴⁰ The conclusion is inescapable that in Apostolic times individual ministers often performed a variety of functions, and, conversely, various functions of the ministry were often performed by a number of officials.⁴¹

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH POLITY

Though the structure of the ministerial constitution is indefinite, there are certain underlying principles governing the church polity of the Apostolic age which are clearly discernible. The practice of delegating ministerial duties among several church officers was

apparently well established. We think here of the election of the Seven in the Jerusalem congregation, the place of the deacons and deaconesses in the Early Church, the plurality of officers at Jerusalem, Antioch, Philippi, and elsewhere, the emphasis on the diversity of gifts in the Church, Paul's willingness to leave the administration of the Sacraments to others, etc.

The modern church could increase its effectiveness very greatly by following the pattern of the Apostolic Church in this matter. Most Christian congregations in contemporary Christendom are served by a ministry of one man, upon whom devolve all the duties and responsibilities of the ministerial office. It might prove profitable to remember that this is a departure from the practice of Apostolic times.

It should be noted that the delegation of ministerial duties is the prerogative of the *ecclesia*. In the Apostolic age the congregation was autonomous, and the officers of the church were not regarded as having exclusive powers. The epistles which deal with congregational life and work are always addressed to the saints, and the admonitions and instructions contained in them are directed to the entire Christian community rather than to any local officer in authority over them. The same principle is evident in the exercise of church discipline: in First Corinthians 5 the assembled congregation is instructed to expel a man (1 Cor. 5:1-5; see also 2 Cor. 2:5-7). Acts 15 describes how the church commissioned apostles to go from Antioch to Jerusalem, how the church at Jerusalem was asked to discuss the controversy that had arisen, and how the church at Antioch received the report and rejoiced in it. Financial affairs were in the hands of the congregation as a whole. (Rom. 15:26; 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Corinthians 8 f.; etc.)

This fact that the ministry functioned distributively in the Early Church, and that the *ecclesia* possessed the right to delegate duties, leads to the conclusion that while the public ministry is divinely instituted, the form which the ministry assumes in any given generation, or any given situation, should be determined by the *ecclesia*, which has complete liberty in the matter.⁴² The *ecclesia* may include in its ministerium such officers as its changing circumstances require, and even as the Early Church had Apostles, prophets, teachers, deacons, elders, etc., so the needs of the contemporary

Church may be met by missionaries, synodical officials, pastors, parish teachers, superintendents, vicars, stewardship secretaries, college professors, deaconesses, etc. All belong to the ministry of the Church.

In considering the question of rank within the office of the public ministry and the relative authority of the different ecclesiastical officers, we must examine various factors. There is, first of all, the basic principle laid down by our Lord: "And there was also a strife among them which of them should be accounted the greatest. And He said unto them: The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors; but ye shall not be so. But he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (Luke 22:24-26. See also Matt. 18:1; 23:10-11; Mark 9:34.) The later hierarchical development in the constitution of the ministry was a departure from this principle of equality within the office of the ministry. It is true that certain ministerial functions are regarded as more important than others. There is certainly significance in the pre-eminence given to the office of the Apostles in Ephesians 4 and 1 Corinthians 12 (see especially v. 31). Undoubtedly the references to bishops and deacons in Philippians and in First Timothy imply that the former occupied a more responsible position than the latter. We know, too, that Paul exercised authority over Timothy, and in the opinion of many Timothy, in turn, exercised authority over the elders at Ephesus (1 Tim. 5: 17-20).

On the other hand, when Paul and Barnabas had a dispute about Mark (Acts 15:37 f.), they settled the question as equals, and there is no indication whatever that Paul held a higher rank in the ministry than Barnabas. Peter in his epistle calls himself a "fellow elder" (1 Pet. 5:1). In the controversy at Jerusalem (Acts 15) a conclusion is reached after a general discussion among the Apostles, elders, and members of the *ecclesia*, and again we find no hint of hierarchical authority.

It is plain therefore that whatever pre-eminence exists within the ministerium of the church, and whatever relative authority is vested in an incumbent of the ministerial office, must be regarded as entirely functional, and not official, in origin. In other words, one

church officer may occupy a position of leadership over others, or a teacher may become a superintendent of teachers, or a pastor may be the chief pastor of a congregation, or a professor may become the president of a college, but this is never a matter of rank, but of responsibility.

THE PASTORATE IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH

This basic principle must be kept in mind in understanding the place of the pastorate in the public ministry of the modern church. It is a mistake to identify the pastorate with the ministry or to speak of other church offices as auxiliary offices to the pastorate. To assume that the pastorate is the one divinely instituted office and that all other offices flow out of the pastorate is a misapprehension. The ministry of the Word is the one divinely instituted office, and the pastorate is a branch of that ministry, just as other church offices are a branch of the same ministry.

A pastor's divinely ordained responsibility is to preach the Word, but he may also be expected to perform auxiliary functions. This is what Luther had in mind when he called the ministry of the Word the "highest office in Christendom." He goes on to say: "If he does not wish to do this (i. e., baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, attend to pastoral duties), he may adhere to preaching and leave the other secondary offices (*Unteraemter*) to others, as Christ and all the Apostles did."⁴³

This principle applies not only to the pastorate. The teacher, the stewardship secretary, the college professor, the deaconess, the institutional missionary, and all others who constitute the *ministerium ecclesiae*, are sometimes required to serve in subordinate capacities and must perform secondary tasks in the ministry.

The Lutheran Confessions speak of the ministry of the Word as the "highest office in the Church": "Of all acts of worship that is the greatest, most holy, most necessary and highest, which God has required in the First and Second Commandments, namely, to preach the Word of God. For the ministry is the highest office in the Church."⁴⁴ This was written in opposition to the papists, who attached great importance to ceremonial observances and often regarded the proclamation of the Word as a secondary factor in the duties of the minister.

Walther's position on this question is difficult to determine, but apparently he did identify the ministry with the pastorate; and when he speaks of deacons as incumbents of an inferior office, and speaks of "other public offices" in the church as "auxiliary offices," the conclusion is almost inescapable that he regarded the pastorate as the highest office in the church and all other ecclesiastical offices as subordinate and auxiliary.⁴⁵

The *ministerium ecclesiae* has many branches, and the incumbents of the public ministry perform a multiplicity of functions, not all of which are of equal importance and urgency; and if a comparison of these offices is to be made, and one is to be regarded as a higher, or as "the highest," office in the ministry, this differentiation must be made, not on the basis of station or position, but on the basis of function. The question is not: who holds the highest office? but: what is the highest office? And the answer is: the highest office in the public ministry is the ministry of the Word. The Seven in Acts 6 accepted an auxiliary function of the ministry when they were ordained to take over the work of the daily ministrations, but we know that at least two of them ⁴⁶ also engaged in the "highest office of the ministry," the preaching of the Word. The officers referred to in 1 Tim. 5:17 were all members of the *ministerium*, and all shared the position of elder in the church and as such were all overseers of the flock, but their functions were not identical. Thus, in the modern church, within the various offices of the church, there are some functions which are more honorable than others. Thus a pastor is performing the highest office in the church when he preaches a sermon, instructs his catechumens, or brings the Gospel to the deathbed of a sinner. He performs an inferior, an auxiliary, a subordinate, office when he presides over his church council, when he meets with his budget committee, when he distributes alms (and Luther would add, when he administers the Sacraments). A schoolteacher performs the highest office in the ministry when he teaches the Word to his class of children, when he teaches the Bible to a youth group, when he addresses the congregation on the need for Christian training. He performs an auxiliary office in the ministry when he acts as secretary of the voters' assembly, when he plays the organ at a wedding, when he gives instruction in penmanship.

The public ministry in the Apostolic age was not confined to the ministry of the Word. The Seven in Acts 6 were called and ordained to the task of serving tables. 1 Tim. 5:17 tells us that there were elders who did not labor in the Word and doctrine. And it is very possible that the deacons of 1 Timothy did not perform the ministry of the Word, since their qualifications do not include "aptness to teach." In other words, we cannot identify the *ministerium ecclesiae* with the *ministerium verbi*.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND PREROGATIVES OF MINISTERS

We, then, are to be regarded as incumbents of the public ministry, and how can we differentiate between clergy and laity? To arrive at a conclusion in this matter, it is necessary to examine the ministry of the Apostolic age in terms of its function and purpose. The purpose of the ministry is stated in Eph. 4:11-12: "He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." The purpose of the ministry is to equip the believers in every way for the service they have to do, so that the Body of Christ might be built up. The building of the Church is the great and ultimate objective of the public ministry.

To achieve this high purpose, the principal emphasis in the work of the ministry must be placed upon the preaching and teaching of the Gospel. The Apostle tells Timothy: "Till I come, attend to the public reading of Scripture, to preaching, to teaching" (1 Tim. 4:13, RSV). "Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and doctrine (2 Tim. 4:2). To Titus (1:9) he writes that a bishop will "hold fast the faithful Word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." In Acts 20:24 Paul describes to the elders at Ephesus his own work and expresses the hope that he might finish "the ministry which [he] had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." Since the aim of the ministry is the conversion and edification and preservation of human souls (1 Cor. 19:22; Eph. 4:13-16; 1 Cor. 1:21), it must be regarded as self-evident that the public preaching of the Gospel is the central and most important function of the public ministry.

However, it was *not* the *only* function of the public ministry. We know that the incumbents of the ministry shared a great diversity of responsibilities. Their task included the visitation of the sick (James 5:14), the daily ministration to the needy (Acts 6: 2-4), and many administrative duties (1 Tim. 5:17) which did not involve the public preaching of the Word. It must be noted, therefore, that the preaching and teaching of the Word was not the only function of the ministry, nor was it the function only of the ministry (Acts 8:1-4). Witnessing in public is not the point of differentiation between the clergy and the laity.

In this connection it should be pointed out that in the Early Church those who were regarded as members of the public ministry were always occupied with the needs of human souls. If there were functionaries and officials in the Early Church whose duties had no direct relation to the building of the Body of Christ and the edification of the saints — officials comparable to our contemporary trustees, church secretaries, janitors, etc. — these were not regarded as incumbents of the public ministry.

It is probable that the members of the Apostolic ministry devoted their entire time to the service of the Church (2 Tim. 2:4), and the passages in Scripture which speak of the duty of the saints to provide for their leaders support this belief, but we cannot conclude from this that only those were regarded as members of the ministry who gave their full time to the work of the Church.

To understand the constitution of the ministry in New Testament times, it is important to note that the idea of rulership is consistently associated with the office of the ministry. It is true, the officers of the Church were servants both of Christ and of the *ecclesia*, and their relationship to the saints was always that of stewards, in whom a trust had been placed (1 Cor. 4:1-2), and yet there are numerous references in the New Testament which establish the fact that the ministerial office included the responsibility of leadership and authority. In Luke 10:16 the Lord tells the Seventy: "He that heareth you, heareth Me." Paul tells the Corinthians (2 Cor. 5: 18-20) that those who perform the ministry of reconciliation are the "ambassadors of Christ." The elders of Ephesus (Acts 20:28) are described as "overseers of the flock." The brethren are told to submit themselves to men like Stephanas (1 Cor. 16:15-16). The

saints at Thessalonica are instructed to "esteem very highly" those that "are over you in the Lord." The Letter to the Hebrews (13:17) gives the very plain admonition to the people: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you." The Apostle Peter instructs the elders to "take the oversight" of the flock of God (1 Pet. 5:2). In 1 Tim. 3:5 we are informed that the ability to rule is one of the qualifications of a bishop. And v. 12 implies that deacons, too, should be capable of leadership. It is noteworthy, moreover, that many of the terms designating officers in the early Christian communities imply a position of presidency and authority. Bishop, presbyter, pastor, *hegoumenoi*, *proistamenoi*—all imply leadership and rulership.⁴⁷

In this matter of the relationship between clergy and laity, it may be well to inject the remark that the modern tendency to minimize the laity's responsibility for the preaching of the Word while we emphasize the need for "lay leadership" in the Church is a trend in the wrong direction. If we reverse the trend, we shall achieve closer conformity to the practice of the New Testament Church. We ought to emphasize the laity's responsibility for the preaching of the Gospel and the evangelization of the world and re-emphasize the clergy's responsibility to supervise, to lead, to admonish, to direct (Acts 8:4; 1 Cor. 14:5, 31).

Of course, it is true, as St. Peter points out (1 Pet. 5:2), that the leadership of the clergy is not to be tyrannical or dictatorial, but pastoral. Though the term "pastor" is rarely used in the New Testament, the pastoral relationship between the clergy and the laity is constantly emphasized. One historian, in discussing the difficulty of tracing the historical development of the official leadership of the Church, says: "This much must be pointed out. In most of its various forms it included the pastoral function, the care of individuals, with the ideal of loving, self-forgetful effort to win them to what the Christian conceives as the highest life and to help them to grow in it."⁴⁸

From the preceding we can surmise that those were regarded as incumbents of the public ministry in the Apostolic age who occupied a position which involved representative functions, super-

visory authority, and pastoral responsibilities. It is unwise arbitrarily to establish a line of demarcation between the clergy and the laity, and it is likely that in the Early Church, when the constitution of the public ministry was in a formative state, the differentiation was not always clearly defined. It is not always possible today to state categorically which church officers in the contemporary Church belong to the public ministry and which do not. However, there is sufficient evidence in the New Testament to justify the conclusion that those who have been called to serve the *ecclesia* in a representative capacity, and who have been given supervisory responsibility, and who have been charged with the care of souls for the purpose of edifying the saints and building the Body of Christ, are all members of the public ministry, be they pastors, parish teachers, college professors, chaplains, superintendents, synodical officials, or institutional missionaries.

In this matter, as in all matters pertaining to the constitution of the public ministry, it must be remembered and emphasized that the *ecclesia* has the liberty to determine how, in any given generation, or in any given area, or in any given organization, the public ministry should be constituted. No church body can claim divine sanction for any particular official order or form, and by the same token no church body has the right to condemn all forms of church polity which differ from its own. The functions of the ministry are clearly set forth in Scripture. The basic principles which are to govern the relationship between clergy and laity can be established from the example of Apostolic times, but the specific form in which the public ministry is constituted in any age, or in any church, must be regarded as an adiaphoron.

REFERENCES

1. C. F. W. Walther, *The Church and the Ministry*, Theses II and III.
2. See also Titus 1:5; 1 Cor. 12:29; 2 Cor. 5:20; 1 Pet. 5:1; Rom. 10:15; Acts 20:28. . . . Also Apology, Art. 13, 11, and Franz Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, 506.
3. Cf. Walther, *op. cit.*, VIII. Also J. B. Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry*, page 5.
4. This position is defended by August Vilmar, *Die Lehre vom geistlichen Amt*.
5. Certainly there were in the Apostolic age incumbents of the ministerial office who occupied their position by virtue of an immediate call, but there is no evidence that these chosen individuals were charged with the perpetuation of the ministry, and there is very considerable evidence in support of

- the principle that the ministry was conferred by the *ecclesia*. First Clement, xlv, 3 — "with the consent of the whole church."
6. Epistles of Ignatius, Romans, iv, 3: "I do not order you as did Peter and Paul; they were Apostles."
 7. Schaff says: "The ministry originally coincided with the apostolate. No other offices are mentioned in the Gospels and the first five chapters of the Acts. But when the believers began to number thousands, the apostles could not possibly perform all the functions of teaching, conducting worship, and administering discipline. There arose gradually, out of the need of the church, the various general and congregational offices. As these all have their common root in the apostolate, so they partake also, in different degrees, of its divine origin, authority, privilege, and responsibility." — *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I, *Apostolic Christianity*, p. 488.
 8. Whether the term "prophets" refers here to Old or New Testament prophets is debatable, but the latter interpretation seems indicated by the sequence. One would expect "Prophets and Apostles" if Old Testament Prophets were meant.
 9. In Acts 21:9 and 1 Cor. 11:5, women are described as having the gift of prophecy. . . . See also Karl von Weizsaecker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, p. 291.
 10. In Acts 11:27 we are told of a delegation of prophets, one of whom was Agabus, being sent to Antioch by the Jerusalem congregation. In Acts 13: 1-3 individuals are named who apparently were resident prophets in the Antioch congregation. In Acts 15:32 Judas and Silas are called prophets.
 11. *Shepherd of Hermas*, mand. xi, 7-9: "The true prophet does not speak of himself, for the Holy Spirit does not speak when a man wishes to speak, but he speaks at that time when God wishes him to speak. Therefore, when the man who has the Divine Spirit comes into a meeting of righteous men, then the angel of the prophetic spirit rests on him and fills the man, and the man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaks to the congregation as the Lord wills."
 12. McGiffert's description of the place of the prophets in the Church of the Apostolic age is an accurate summary of the available evidence: "The gift of prophecy was exercised not exclusively by any particular class in the church but by disciples of all classes. At the same time there were those who possessed the gift in eminent degree, and who exercised it so frequently that they acquired the name of 'prophets' and were distinguished thereby from the brethren in general. They possessed, as the apostles did, a large measure of authority, but their mission was regarded as less exalted and responsible than that of the apostles. All the apostles were prophets endowed by the Spirit with the power to proclaim the truth of God, but not all the prophets were apostles, for the latter were called to the special and more laborious work of preaching the Gospel and planting the church in new territory, but it would be a mistake to draw hard and fast lines in this connection and to suppose that the functions of the apostles in those early days were carefully distinguished from the functions of the prophets." Arthur C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, p. 651. In the *Didache*, xi, 3-12, the terms "Apostles" and "prophets" are used interchangeably: "Let every Apostle who comes to you be received . . . but if he stay, he is a false prophet."
 13. In the *Didache*, xiii, 1-2, and xv, 1-2, the juxtaposition of the terms "prophet" and "teacher" gives support to the view that they shared a common ministry, and the statement that the bishops and deacons "are your

honorable men, together with the prophets and teachers," supports the belief that the latter were the predecessors of the former.

14. It is evident that we must not identify the bestowal of the *charismata* with the bestowal of the ministerial office. It is significant that in Ephesians 4, where we have an enumeration of ministerial offices and a specific reference to the function and purpose of the public ministry, the term *charismata* is not used. In 1 Corinthians 12 and Romans 12 the performance of ministerial duties is implicitly dependent upon *charismata*, but these passages do not deal with church offices. On this see F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 157.
15. This is the position of T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 106.
16. The "brethren" in 3 John may have been such wandering preachers.
17. Acts 8:14; 13:1; etc.
18. Cf. Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 62; McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 656; Knopf, *Das nach-apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 173.
19. Note esp. 1 Cor. 6:1-6.
20. First Clement, xlii, 4: "They (the apostles) preached from district to district and from city to city, and they appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of the future believers." Cf. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The History of the Christian Church*, p. 219, and Burton Scott Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*, p. 225. Also Philip Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 491.
21. That the constitution of the permanent ministry differed at first in the Asiatic and the Western churches is evident from the Apostolic Fathers. The writings of Ignatius reveal an early development of the monarchical episcopate (though not a diocesan episcopate) in the Church of Asia Minor (ad Eph., ii, 2; ad Magn. ii, 1; ad Trall., ii, 3; iii, 1; ad Phil., vii, 1; ad Smyrn., viii, -. 2; ad Polycarp, vi, 1). Though it is possible that Ignatius in his repeated references to the bishop-presbyter-deacon arrangement, and in his constant emphasis on the episcopal authority, is advocating this system rather than describing its universal acceptance, we nevertheless cannot escape the conclusion that a well-developed ministerial organization with episcopal church polity prevailed at the turn of the first century in Asia Minor. The threefold ministry merged also in the Western churches but at a much later date. It is significant that while Ignatius constantly reiterates his position on the threefold ministry and insists on episcopal pre-eminence in his letter to the churches in Asia, he omits mention of this favorite subject when he writes to the Romans. Even more significant is the fact that the author of First Clement, a contemporary of Ignatius, writing from Rome to Corinth, makes no reference to an episcopal system such as Ignatius describes. It is noteworthy, too, that Polycarp, writing to the Philippian, urges the people to be "subject to the presbyters and deacons" (v. 3). And the absence of any reference here to a bishop, though Polycarp himself was bishop of Smyrna, also supports the belief that while the episcopal system emerged very soon after the Apostolic age in the Eastern church, its development in the Western church was considerably slower.
22. Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.*, pp. 213, 222.
23. Lightfoot is correct when he says: "There is no ground for supposing that the work of teaching and the work of governing pertain to separate members of the presbyteral college. As each has his special gift, so would he devote himself more or less exclusively to the one or the other of these sacred functions." J. B. Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry*, p. 28.

24. This is the view of W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire Before 170 A.D.*, p. 198. Also Karl von Weizsaecker, *op. cit.*, p. 327.
25. Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Church*, p. 67.
26. Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 104. Also Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 366; Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 31; Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 212.
27. In Rom. 12:8 there seems to be a reference to the *proistamenoi*, but it cannot be conclusively shown that the term here has any official connotation. It is perhaps significant that in 1 Tim. 3:5 and 5:17 the Apostle, in describing the supervisory duties of the elder-bishops, uses the verb *proisteemi*.
28. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 34. Also Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 174.
29. Easton, *ibid.*, p. 175, says that the only monarchical bishop named in the New Testament is Diotrephes in 3 John 10, who not only "loves the pre-eminence" but is accorded it, for he apparently has the right to excommunicate his adversaries.
30. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
31. Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
32. It is possible that the article before bishop is generic, but not likely, because in the same context the plural is used for deacons.
33. It is interesting to note in this connection that in Luther's time certain churches were ordination centers, where ministers were ordained before their installation in a local congregation, the idea being that the ministry is, on the one hand, an office of the local *ecclesia*, and, on the other, an office of the whole Church. WA, 34, I, 437, 16.
34. The words *diakonos*, *diakonia*, and *diakonein* are used frequently in the New Testament writings, but in all other instances they refer either to any service rendered by anyone or to the special service of the public ministry, but never to the *office* of the ministry. The former usage is found in Matt. 20:28; John 12:26; Rom. 12:7; etc., and the latter in Acts 1:17; 6:4; 1 Cor. 3:5; Col. 1:23, 25; etc.
35. Some find support for this view in 1 Pet. 4:11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister (*diakonei*), let him do it as of the ability which God giveth."
36. E. g., Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 185.
37. The church widows referred to in 1 Timothy 5 were not deaconesses. However, the term "widow" became generic. Ignatius (ad Smyrn., xiii, 1) speaks of virgins who were "widows," and so we may assume that the later institution of widows as an order with official duties was suggested by the Timothy passage, but it is unlikely that these widows were deaconesses who belonged to the public ministry in the Apostolic age.
38. See Herman Sasse, "On the Problem of the Relation Between the Ministry and the Congregation," tr. by E. Reim in *Quartalschrift*, January, 1950.
39. Co-workers of Paul included Timothy, Titus, Epaphras, Tychicus, Silvanus (Silas), Barnabas, Archippus, Stephanas, Onesiphorus, etc.
40. Polycarp is called an "apostolic and prophetic teacher, bishop of the catholic church in Smyrna." *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, xvi, 2.
41. Chemnitz, *Examen Decretum Concilii Tridentini*, Berlin, 1861, p. 475, in "De Sacramento Ordinis" states: "There is no command of God as to which, or how many, of such divisions or classes there should be. At the time of the Apostles there were not in all churches the same divisions or classes, nor the same number of classes or divisions . . . and there was not such

- a distribution of those divisions, but that often one and the same person took over and executed all of those offices which pertain to the ministry, as we know from Apostolic history." (Transl. by A. C. Mueller.)
42. Schaller says: "The congregation has freedom to provide officials for various tasks. The ministry is in every place and every time what the church makes it. It is true that the institution of the office of public preaching must in some form or other exist because of the very nature of the congregation, but the institution of other services in the congregation depends entirely upon the will and the need of the congregation." J. Schaller, *Pastorale Praxis*, pp. 1—7.
 43. St. Louis, x:1548. See also Francis Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 526, and article by A. C. Stellanor, "The Lutheran Teacher's Position in the Ministry of the Congregation," publ. in *Report of 1949 Educational Conference*, Seward, Nebr., p. 47 ff.
 44. Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Art. xv.
 45. C. F. W. Walther, *The Church and the Ministry*, Thesis VIII ("On the Ministry").
 46. Stephen and Philip. Cf. Acts 6:8; 7:2 f.; 8:35.
 47. On this see Edwin Hatch, *op. cit.*, 113, and note also that obedience and submission to the leaders of the church is emphasized in the early Apostolic Fathers. Cf., e. g., First Clement, xxxvii, 1—5; lvii, 1.
 48. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. I, *The First Five Centuries*, p. 252.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, London, 1889.
 Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Church*, London, 1892.
 F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, London, 1897.
 Gerhard Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum N. T.*, Stuttgart, 1933—1938.
 J. B. Lightfoot, "The Christian Ministry," *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, London, 1892.
 T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, London, 1902.
 M. Loy, *Essay on the Ministry*, Columbus, 1870.
 John Oman, *The Church and the Divine Order*, London, 1911.
 John Franklin Spalding, *The Church and Its Apostolic Ministry*.
 August Vilmar, *Die Lehre vom geistlichen Amt*, Leipzig, 1870.
 C. F. W. Walther, *The Church and the Ministry*, translated by W. H. T. Dau, St. Louis, 1938.
 Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, translated by A. J. K. Davidson, New York, 1886.
 Karl von Weizsaecker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, translated by James Millar. London, n. d.
 Burton Scott Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*, New York, 1947.
The Apostolic Fathers, translated by Kirsopp Lake.
 F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The History of the Christian Church*, New York, 1924.
 Rudolf Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*.
 John Kurtz, *Church History*, Vol. I, translated by John MacPherson, London, 1888.

- Kenneh Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. I, New York, c. 1937. *The First Five Centuries*.
- Arthur C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, New York, ca. 1897.
- J. L. Neve, *A History of Christian Thought*, Philadelphia, Vol. I, 1943.
- W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire Before 170 A. D.*, New York, 1912.
- Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I, *Apostolic Christianity*, New York, 1920.
-
- Franz Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. III, St. Louis, 1920.
- W. Rohnert, *Die Dogmatik der Ev.-Lutherischen Kirche*, Leipzig, 1902.
- Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, translated by Charles Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, Philadelphia, 1899.
- Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Leipzig, 1908.
- Herman Sasse, *Relation between the Ministry and the Congregation*, translated by E. Reim in *Quartalschrift*, January, 1950.
- A. T. Robertson, "Christ's Call for Preachers," *Review and Expositor*, Vol. 33, July, 1936.
- Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, articles on "Church and Ministry."
- International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, article on "Bishop."
- J. Schaller, *Pastorale Praxis*, Milwaukee, 1913.
- A. C. Mueller, *The Status of the Parochial School Teacher* (Unprinted Essay).
- J. F. Boerger, Sr., *The Call of the Teacher*, 1941 (Unprinted Essay).
- A. C. Stellanor, *The Lutheran Teacher's Position in the Ministry of the Congregation*, 1949 (*Proc.*, Ed. Conf., 1949).
- Milwaukee, Wis.

A Short History of the Lutheran Church in Great Britain

By E. GEORGE PEARCE

"LUTHERAN" is a word that many English people find hard to pronounce because it is so seldom used in this country. In few countries of Western Europe is the Lutheran Church as little known as it is in Great Britain. When recently an inquiry was made at the B.B.C. in London regarding the possibility of a Lutheran religious broadcast, the surprising reply was given: "It is the policy of the B.B.C. to broadcast only the services of those churches which are in the mainstream of the Christian tradition." How strange that the largest of all Protestant churches should be largely unknown in a country which has always been a bastion of Protestant Christianity! Today the word "Lutheran" comes somewhat easier to the English tongue because of the influx of tens of thousands of Lutheran refugee workers. Four centuries ago it was a common English word, not only in church circles, but even among the populace. The intervening four hundred years record interesting pulsations in the history of the Lutheran Church in Great Britain. At one time political expediency almost made her the official religion of the English people, at another period she was the only non-Anglican Church allowed by law, for another and long period she was the third official faith of the English court, but for the most of those four centuries she has been content to carry on quietly in her restricted sphere and away from the public eye.

LUTHER IN ENGLAND

The history of the Lutheran Church in England begins with Martin Luther in Germany. Less than four weeks after he had nailed his Ninety-Five Theses to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, people were talking about them in Oxford and London. From England admiring eyes watched the Saxon monk boldly challenge the Roman colossus. Merchant ships plying the Channel from ports in the Low Countries smuggled Luther's latest books under bags of flax into England, where they were read avidly. Oxford and Cambridge became the distributing centers of Lutheran teachings. Bishops and King rose to stem the tide. Henry VIII, in a surprisingly scholarly book, denounced

"the little friar of Wittenberg" as a heretic more dangerous than all infidels, Saracens, and Turks put together. For this effort Rome rewarded him with the title that still appears on every British coin: *Defensor Fidei*. But more than a book was needed, however royal its author. The King's displeasure notwithstanding, Luther's influence continued to grow and to spread. Near King's College at Cambridge was a public house that was called "Little Germany" because it became the focus of the Lutheran Reformation in England. Here the latest events of Luther's stand against the Pope were discussed; here the latest writings of Luther read and circulated. Among those who gathered in secret at this tavern were two young divinity students who years later as primates of the English Church had much to do to shape the course of the Reformation in this country: Thomas Cranmer and Matthew Parker.

HENRY VIII AND ENGLISH LUTHERANS

It was during this period that two Englishmen came forth whom Lutherans in this country will always hold in the highest regard. One was Robert Barnes, like Luther an Augustinian monk, who was destined to become the first prominent English Lutheran martyr. The other was William Tyndale, the translator of the English Bible. Both were close friends of Luther; both attended his lectures at Wittenberg, Tyndale matriculating under the name of Guillelmus Daltici in 1524, Barnes as Antonius Anglus in 1533; both found refuge in Luther's home when the ire of King Henry drove them from England. Barnes' fiery and eloquent espousal of Lutheran doctrine filled the Augustinian chapel at Cambridge and traveled far beyond it. Of the entry into England of Tyndale's immortal translation, linked so closely with Luther's, the fiercest Roman Catholic opponent, Cochlaeus, said in a letter to Henry: "This is the way to fill your realm with Lutherans." Men like these and like Patrick Hamilton of Scotland caused Lutheranism to spread quickly all over Britain and to give promise of becoming the religion of the people. A surprising development took place which brought support from an unexpected source. Henry of England suddenly became friendly toward the Lutherans in Germany. In his conflict with the Pope over the question of his divorce, the King saw a Papist coalition of France and Spain rising against him. Robert Barnes, a fugitive heretic at Luther's home, was invited to return to England to become Henry's personal chaplain. Negotiations were opened with the Lutheran Smalcaldic League. Barnes returned to Germany in 1535 as a member of an English theological commission appointed by the King to discuss doctrine with a delegation of Lutherans headed by the

great Reformer and Melancthon. Article by article, the Augsburg Confession—the only basis the Lutherans would allow—was discussed. The results were most encouraging. Returning to England, Barnes' committee met again, this time under the chairmanship of Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to write a statement of faith for the new Church in England. The confession this royal commission produced, the Thirteen Articles, was never officially sanctioned as the doctrinal statement of the English Church, but became indirectly the basis for the Thirty-Nine Articles, subscription to which is demanded to this day of all Anglican clergy. By this time, however, the political threat to England had passed, and Henry resumed his true role as a persecutor of English Lutherans, whether at home or abroad. William Tyndale, after a fruitful but fugitive life on the Continent, was betrayed into the hands of English agents, was strangled, and then burned at Vilvorde near Brussels in 1536. Four years later Robert Barnes was burnt at the stake as a heretic in London. Martin Luther honored his English Lutheran friend, who had so often sat at his table, by translating and publishing Barnes' dying confession into German. Henry's own death in 1547 brought this period, which is so interesting to the Lutheran historian, to a close. But for this one man—Henry VIII—England might have become Lutheran. Anne Boleyn, one of his wives, is said to have been a Lutheran in secret.

THE FIRST LUTHERAN CONGREGATIONS IN BRITAIN

The next landmark in the Lutheran history of Great Britain was the establishment of the first Lutheran congregation in the City of London in 1669. This was a different England than that which Henry VIII had ruled. By now the Church of England, which had oscillated so fitfully between Wittenberg, Rome, and Geneva during the first thirty years of the Reformation, had settled down. The Elizabethan settlement established the Anglican Church and gave her the midcourse position in theology and practice that she holds to this day. The first Lutheran congregation in Great Britain, founded during the reign of Charles II, was not the lineal descendant of the English Lutherans of Henry's day. If there was a connection, the link was the church of foreign Christians that worshiped since the reign of Edward VI in Austin Friars in London. Headed by the illustrious Polish nobleman and Calvinist theologian John à Lasco, this congregation was made up of German- and French-speaking Protestant refugees and probably included Lutherans even though it was strongly Reformed in character. These foreign Protestants enjoyed even more liberty than Englishmen themselves. They were not subject to the Act of Uniformity of Ed-

ward VI which forbade every type of worship other than that of the Book of Common Prayer. When, one hundred years later, after the stringent Puritanism of Oliver Cromwell, this same law was enacted again by the Parliament of Charles II, the Lutherans were not exempt. In all of the United Kingdom but one form of religion was allowed; the law required every Englishman to be an Anglican. There were no exceptions. Heavy penalties were dealt out to offenders. Yet this was the England which allowed the establishment of Hamburg Lutheran Church within the walls of its ancient capital in the year 1669. Why did Charles II make this one startling exception? Certainly not because he was a crypto-Lutheran. Like all the Stuart kings, his deepest sympathies were toward Rome. But it was a noteworthy group of Lutherans who approached him. They were members of the wealthy Hanseatic League whose trade Charles needed badly to furnish the funds to pay off an expensive war with the Dutch and to rebuild London gutted by the Great Fire of 1666. Furthermore, at the head of this Lutheran delegation was the ambassador of the Swedish king, his military ally against the territorial ambitions of Louis XIV of France. Charles's Royal Charter gave England her first independent Lutheran congregation and made her at this time the only legal free church in the whole of Great Britain.

This first-born of Lutheran churches in Great Britain exemplified an ideal toward which modern Lutheranism is only today finding its way: it was a church in which the deciding factor for admission was faith and not nationality or language. It was open to anyone who espoused the Lutheran faith. The original congregation had members from each of the three large Lutheran blocs of that day: Germans, Scandinavians, and Balts. This ideal was short-lived, however, for twenty years later, when the Act of Toleration was passed under William III, the Scandinavians withdrew and founded their own place of worship in Well Close Square, a short distance from the Tower of London. The first pastor was the Rev. Iver Brinch, well-known as an hymnologist in Scandinavian circles. Around the turn of the century the foundation of several more new congregations completed the process, and Lutheranism assumed the specific national pattern it exhibits to this day in Britain. War between Denmark and Sweden at this time caused the Swedish Lutherans to secede from the joint Scandinavian body in Well Close Square and to found their own in Swedenborg Square in Stepney in 1728. Hamburg Lutheran Church meanwhile became a purely German-speaking church. A second and a third were added when St. Mary's Lutheran Church of the Savoy was established in the ancient Savoy

Palace on the Thames in 1694 and the Lutheran Court Chapel in St. James' Palace in 1700.

The interesting and continuous history of both of these latter-named congregations deserves more than a mention. The Court Chapel of St. James was erected at the expense of George of Denmark, Consort to Queen Anne, for the benefit of the royal household. The subsequent accession of the Hanoverian dynasty placed George I, a Lutheran, on the throne of England, made a Lutheran the titular head of the Anglican Church, and raised the Lutheran Chapel at St. James' Palace to a recognized place of worship for the British Royal Family. Lutheranism became the third official faith of the English court. To add to the confusion, a German translation of the Book of Common Prayer became the regular service book of this Lutheran congregation! This anomalous situation persisted for well over a hundred years until the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1837, when the Hanoverian succession came to an end. In 1901 the Lutheran Court Chapel of St. James was suddenly and without explanation dissolved by the royal decree of Edward VII. Through the liberality of the well-known Lutheran philanthropist Baron von Schroeder this homeless 200-year-old congregation was given a new and beautiful Gothic home — Christ Church in Kensington, erected in 1904.

An arched doorway is all that remains of the Church of St. Mary le Savoy, the third German Lutheran congregation whose history goes back to the seventeenth century. Bombers of the *Luftwaffe* laid waste the church during the terrible ordeal of the Battle of Britain. Londoners say that the West End, in which the building stood, received special attention from the German Air Force because it contained the underground headquarters of the Supreme Allied Command. This was the Church which Queen Victoria had ordered to be built on Crown land when the old Savoy Palace, the home of the congregation for nearly two hundred years, was demolished. At one time the elders of this congregation addressed a request to the English King appealing for aid to pay the pastor's salary. The unlooked-for result was a document bearing the signatures of King George II and the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole, guaranteeing an annual subsidy of £40.

The eighteenth century was a comparatively quiet period as far as Lutheran expansion in Great Britain was concerned. Other than St. George's German Lutheran Church — also rich in historical lore — which was built in Whitechapel in London in 1762, available records show no new Lutheran endeavor. The last half of the nineteenth century, however, found the Lutheran Church venturing beyond the capital city and extending itself to all parts of the United Kingdom.

LUTHERAN SEAMEN'S MISSIONS

This increase was due largely to the efforts of various Lutheran seamen's societies. The middle decades of the last century witnessed a widespread concern among Christians in seafaring nations for spiritual service to sailors. The movement began in Great Britain with the organization of the Port of London Society in 1818. Since the Scandinavian countries supplied a large proportion of seamen for the world's merchant shipping, it was but natural that this movement found favor there. In 1864 the Norwegian Seamen's Mission was organized at Bergen under the initiative of Pastor Storjohann, who later served in this work in London. Within a few years this Society had stations and pastors at Leith, North Shields, Cardiff, and London in Great Britain besides in ports in other parts of the world. The Norwegians were quickly followed by the Danes, who added new stations in England at Hull and Grimsby, Newcastle and Hartlepool, then by the Swedes in 1869, with missions at Liverpool, Grimsby, Gloucester, and London, finally by the Finns in 1880, with seamen's centers in London, Grimsby, and Hull. Later the German Church set up seamen's missions in several British ports, in the cases of Hull and Liverpool coupling them with the resident congregations founded earlier by immigrants stranded in these ports while on their way from Germany via England to America. At this time, too, a Latvian seamen's pastor lived at Cardiff. Over the course of years some of these sailors' stations have been dropped and others added, but this very necessary work still goes on as one of the most prominent and distinctive aspects of Lutheran activity in Great Britain.

BEGINNINGS OF BRITISH LUTHERANISM

It was also this stage that marked the entry of American Lutheranism and a new type of Lutheran enterprise in this country: work among the local English population which would lead eventually to a native Lutheran church in England—the spiritual successors to Robert Barnes and other English Lutherans of the sixteenth century. It was The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which in 1896 sent the Rev. F. W. Schulze from America in response to an unexpected request from six young Lutheran bakers in London to send them a pastor. Upon his arrival, Pastor Schulze met with the six laymen in a factory in Camden Town, and Immanuel Lutheran Church came into being. Forty-two years later, on the occasion of the dedication of its new church in Kentish Town, the congregation altered its name to Luther-Tyndale Memorial Church. This adoption of the names of the German Reformer and the translator of the English Bible symbolized the objective en-

visioned: an English Lutheran church. Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, organized in South Tottenham in 1903, is the second congregation making up the Evangelical Lutheran Church of England. These two purely English-speaking Lutheran churches were during the war years the spiritual homes of thousands of Lutheran servicemen from English-speaking Allied countries all over the world.

POSTWAR LUTHERAN INFLUX

A sketch of Lutheran activity in Great Britain must take into account two significant developments of the present day: the great influx of Lutheran volunteer workers and the consequent formation of the Lutheran Council of Great Britain. One of the cruelly persisting effects of the Second World War and its attendant horrors has been the displacement of populations. In this age of mass expulsions and forced exile, of all Christian communions the Lutheran Church has been perhaps the greatest loser. Characteristically, Great Britain was one of the first countries to open her arms to displaced people. In the four years from 1946 to 1949 under various schemes initiated by the British Ministry of Labour, over 100,000 were admitted into the country, the majority as European Volunteer Workers. About one third of these are Lutherans, most of them from the Baltic countries and Germany, others from eastern European lands, where Lutheranism is a minority faith. To these may be added 2,500 Polish Lutherans who were formerly soldiers in Gen. Anders' Army, and an estimated 25,000 ex-P.O.W.s and other German Lutherans who were permitted to remain in this country. This recent invasion of Lutherans altered the whole situation and created problems that never had to be faced before in 280 years of history.

LUTHERAN COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN

To meet the great problem of bringing spiritual ministrations to these thousands of new Lutherans, speaking eight or nine different languages and scattered all over England, Scotland, and Wales, the Lutheran Council of Great Britain was formed in London on March 18, 1948. Preliminary efforts were made as early as 1946 and 1947 through free grants from The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod to individual Polish and Latvian pastors in London, but it was soon felt that the task at hand called for a concerted and co-ordinated program. In response to an invitation of the Rev. E. Geo. Pearce, pastor of the English Lutheran Church and representative of the Missouri Synod in Great Britain, Dr. Jaak Taul (Estonian), Senior Pastor W. Fierla (Polish), and Pastor R. Slokenbergs (Latvian) came together in what is now the

Polish Lutheran Center in London and on March 18, 1948, established the Lutheran Council of Great Britain. The fledgling Council was faced with a formidable question: how to find the ways and means of bringing the Gospel to the 50,000 new Lutherans known to be in this country. At the same time other Lutherans were tackling the same problem. In January, 1948, Dr. David Ostergren arrived in England to conduct a survey of Lutheran refugees on behalf of the National Lutheran Council of America. German ex-P. O. W.s and domestic workers arriving from Germany gave the independent German Lutheran congregations in London a responsibility they could not decline. Two difficulties faced all three parties: men and money. Some pastors were available in England, but, like their fellow European Volunteer Workers, they were under contract to work only in hospitals, factories, or farms. These could be released, German pastors could be gotten from the Continent, Polish chaplains could be demobilized and employed, but for this funds were necessary. The needed financial backing was supplied when after a series of meetings in London and Chicago the two American bodies, the National Lutheran Council and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, agreed to assume equal shares of the costs of a united project. Consequently the Lutheran Council was enlarged to include Dr. Ostergren, representative of the National Lutheran Council, and Dr. H. H. Kramm for the existing independent German Lutheran congregations in this country.

The Lutheran Council of Great Britain enjoys the recognition of the ecclesiastical authorities of the various parent churches in Europe and America which are concerned. Its purpose, as laid down in a memorandum dated April 30, 1948: "the provision of spiritual ministrations for each of the several groups in its own language and cultus." The Lutheran Council of Great Britain is not a church and therefore does not affect in any way the confessional or organization affiliations of any of the Lutheran groups associated with it. It "operates on the understanding that the direction of work within each group is left in the hands of its authorized representative on the Council, who, in turn, is responsible individually to the Council as a whole for the efficient carrying out of spiritual service among the pastors and people he represents," as the above memorandum states.

Under the blessing of Almighty God the Lutheran Council, during its first three years of existence, has gone a long way toward finding a common solution to the many problems which arose when tens of thousands of displaced Lutherans streamed into British towns and villages from D. P. camps in Germany. All pastors have been released

from secular labor; other new pastors have been brought in from the Continent. The work of preserving the new Lutherans of Britain for their old Church has been launched. Annual pastoral conferences are gradually leveling the walls that divide and bringing these diverse scattered elements together. Two important events testify to the same appreciation of a common spiritual heritage growing among the laity: the International Lutheran Rally held at Westminster Chapel in London on July 17, 1949, where a thousand Lutherans of all nationalities gathered to hear four prominent Lutheran churchmen: Bishop Nygren, Bishop Lilje, Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, and Dr. Theo. Graebner; the other, the 1950 Reformation Festival Concert at one of London's large concert halls, presented by the combined choirs that make up the newly organized London Lutheran Choral Society.

Confessionally, the future of the Lutheran Church in Great Britain bodes well. Theological discussions, a regular feature on the agenda of Lutheran Council meetings since its inception, reveal a genuine appreciation of, and adherence to, the conservative teachings of the Lutheran Reformation. May God grant that out of these diversified elements a new Lutheran Church will one day emerge, loyal to the Holy Scriptures and to their common historic Confessions, and He shall have all the glory.

London, England

HOMILETICS

EISENACH OLD TESTAMENT SELECTIONS

March 4	Laetare	Is. 52:7-10	The Glad Supply of God's Grace
March 11	Judica	Num. 21:4-9	Life Through Christ
March 18	Palm Sunday	Zech. 9:9-13	The Humble and Powerful Savior
March 22	Maundy Th.	Psalm 111	Forgiveness of Sins in Communion
March 23	Good Friday	Ps. 22:1-19	Christ Died for Us
March 25	Easter	Ps. 118:14-24	Our Resurrection in Christ's

Sermon Study on Numbers 21:4-9 for Judica

This passage takes us to the close of the wanderings of the Children of Israel from Egypt to the Promised Land. The Promised Land lay almost within sight. Only the narrow strip of country occupied by the Edomites lay between them and the approach to the Jordan. The Edomites were a warlike people, and their mountainous country favored its defense. They were historically enemies of Israel, and now that Israel was at their borders, there was no inclination to let them through. Israel indeed promised: "We will not pass through the fields or through thy vineyards, neither will we drink of the water of the wells. We will go by the king's highway. We will not turn to the right hand nor to the left, until we have passed thy borders." But the answer came back: "Thou shalt not pass by me lest I come out against thee with the sword." And to show that this was no empty threat the army of Edom was massed at the border and poised for battle. This was deeply discouraging to Israel, for it meant retracing their steps all the way to the head of the gulf of Akaba and then going east into the desert to circle the land of Edom. And when, in their turning back to the south, Arad, the Canaanite, attacked them and took some of them prisoners, then, though with the Lord's help the Canaanites were completely wiped out, the prospect of now setting forth to "compass the land of Edom," caused their discouragement to mount to rebellion, and they cried out against God and against Moses: "Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness?

For there is no bread, neither is there any water; and our soul loatheth this light bread." The punishment was immediate. God sent fiery serpents among the people. The little serpents were perhaps the serpentlike lizards, that are still to be seen in that region, according to travelers. They were fiery, possibly because of their brilliant coloring, but more likely, because of the intense burning caused by the bite and the raging fever which resulted from it. Death followed in short order, and so on all sides the people were perishing in the agony of convulsions. The fearful sight brought the people to their senses and to a recognition of the magnitude of their guilt. We say the magnitude of their guilt because for the first time it is distinctly said that the people murmured *against God* and against Moses, even as the contemptuous reference to the manna as "this light bread" was a direct slap at God, their Benefactor. The people begged Moses, as they had always done before, to be their intercessor, and he did not fail them in spite of all their provocation. Nor did the Lord fail them when He saw the sincerity of their repentance, but commanded Moses to make a fiery serpent of brass, an enlarged image of the little serpents that bit them, and promised: "It shall come to pass that everyone that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." Moses did so and raised the serpent of brass on a high pole so that it could be seen in all areas of the camp, "and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived."

The story follows the pattern with which we have become so familiar in the journey of Israel to the Promised Land: rebellion — repentance and forgiveness. But this incident stands out as particularly instructive to us New Testament Christians, by the use which our Lord made of it when He took it as a pattern for the efficacy of His Cross, saying in John 3:14-15: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." It is from this comparison that some very comforting truths emerge for us, the children of God under the new covenant.

For one thing, when we consider that this serpent of brass was one of the last of a long series of deliverances, it is a type of the inexhaustible mercy of God, who never fails His people, no matter

how often they rebel, if they return to Him in sincere repentance; even as Moses makes this unfailing compassion of God the basis for all his intercessory pleas: "Pardon, I beseech Thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of Thy mercy and as Thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now" (ch. 14:19). When we review the history of their rebellions, we are overwhelmed with the boundless depth of God's forgiving love. Hardly has ceased the tremendous exhibition of His power in the great plagues of Egypt when, standing at the shores of the Red Sea, the people are discouraged. Hardly has He shown the might of His arm in the parting of the waters of the Red Sea and the drowning of the armies of Pharaoh when the people murmur at the bitter waters of Marah. Hardly has He sweetened the waters of Marah when the people cry for food. Hardly has He fed them with manna from heaven when the people are ready to make a golden calf and worship it as the God of Israel. And so it goes. At Taberah, at Hazeroth, upon the return of the spies, the people are bitter and complaining. What endless patience and long-suffering! Truly the Lord is right when He says: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." And now the serpent of brass, coming at the close of their long series of deliverances, can stand as a permanent symbol, graven in imperishable brass, of the unchanging mercy of God.

And having this symbol, in the words of Jesus, as a type of His Cross, we can see in the Cross the same assurance of the inexhaustible nature of God's mercy, even as we have in rebellions of Israel a type of the rebellion of God's children in all times and climes. We have no reason either as a Church or as individual Christians, either as a nation, or as individual citizens, to point with scorn to the incurable tendency of Israel to murmur and complain. Our history is full of it. All sin in its final analysis is rebellion against God, dissatisfaction with His government of the world and our individual lives, disagreement with His definition of true happiness, disobedience to the heavenly vision. But, like the serpent, the Cross stands there as symbol of the inexhaustible mercy of God, which, whenever man returns, in sincere repentance, from his first or his tenth rebellion, will bring him forgiveness and healing.

The bite of the fiery serpents with its inevitably fatal effect, so

sudden and so sure, that the victim, as soon as he was bitten, knew that he was doomed, is a perfect symbol of the fatal character of sin. Unfortunately, sin works much more insidiously, and its poison is such that its ultimate death-producing character is not so quickly felt and discerned. But the end is just as inevitable and even more fatal, for the consequences are not limited to time, but extend to eternity. If men could see the fatal end of sin as clearly as they can see the fatal end of cancer or of heart disease, or as the Israelite realized the fatal end of the serpent's bite, perhaps the return to repentance would come more quickly and more sincerely. But whatever the fatal character of sin and its awful doom, the Cross stands there, like the serpent of brass, the sure promise of perfect healing. In the serpent's bite and the serpent of brass, in sin and the Cross, we have a beautiful picture of the Apostle's word: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Let the child of God write this deeply upon his soul, to remember it in every situation and period of life, in youth and in age: "Thou art never beyond hope." Sin is terrible and, unchecked, inevitably fatal, but the Cross is its unfailing and omnipotent master.

2. We speak much of the salvation of the Cross being by grace through faith. What we mean is that the salvation is entirely God's work and in no way prepared for or merited by man. All that man can do is to accept what God gives. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is a gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." How clearly this fact is apparent as we look at the serpent of brass, a type of the Cross. What could the Israelite do to merit the healing? His contribution in the whole transaction was only this, that by his rebellion he brought about his punishment, the poison of death in his veins. He stood powerless in the face of the disease. He could do nothing to heal it. The healing was entirely apart from him and came through the serpent of brass. In other words, it was entirely prepared by God, placed in the serpent by His power and promise. And that which God gave, and was in no way prepared or merited by the Israelite, was taken by the Israelite simply by looking. How foolish to think, as some Israelite may have felt, that from a serpent of brass, which he could not even touch, healing could come for a deadly poison, but so it was. It was the cure, simply because God said that it would be

and because He was faithful to His promise. Can anything more strikingly illustrate the all-sufficiency of grace and the all-sufficiency of faith? In comparing the Cross to the serpent of brass, Jesus is crying to the world, in the words of Isaiah (45:22): "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth."

3. And the comparison with the serpent of brass further emphasizes the mystery of the Cross. And though the mystery of the Cross is dwelt on by the Apostles, especially the Apostles Paul and John, in a way that could and should afford opportunity for the intensest study to the end of time, the efficacy of the Cross does not depend upon the measure of that study or the degree of progress in it, but remains complete and perfect, though only little progress has been made in its understanding, as in children. There it is, the Cross, the Savior uplifted like the serpent of brass, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ Crucified . . . the power of God and the wisdom of God." The Israelite was not saved by understanding *how* the Serpent of brass could heal him, but by believing that it could heal him.

4. And we have here a fine setting forth of objective and subjective justification. The serpent of brass hanging there was the proclamation of God to *all* Israel that their sin was forgiven. Anyone, which means *everyone*, who looked at it was healed. It was God's objective declaration that the sin of His people was forgiven. But the healing was received only by him who believed and looked. He that did not believe and look died of the poison of the fiery serpent. Not that there was not power in the serpent of brass to heal him, but he did not believe and look.

5. And is it not likewise, as another emphasis of the comparison, a symbol which shouts to the world: "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved"? Was there any healing for the Israelite outside the serpent of brass? Would any Israelite come to Moses, saying he had been bitten and he was dying but could not see how the serpent of brass could heal him and that there must be another way? No Israelite could have done that, for he would have been dead by the time he got to Moses. The notion was too foolish

to entertain. Unfortunately, the poison of sin works much more slowly, and men do think there is another way to heaven besides the Cross, but in reality the thought is just as absurd and foolish and fatal as it would have been in the case of a stricken Israelite. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

6. And finally the comparison of the Cross with the serpent of brass makes clear the relation between justification and sanctification. The Israelite could not fail to see whence his health had come, his capacity to live and walk once more. It had come from the serpent. Nor could he fail to see what the healing was which the serpent of brass gave him. It was just this capacity to live and walk once more. That living body with all of its capacities was the gift of the serpent. He could by no possible stretch of imagination have said: The fever is still there, my muscles are paralyzed, I am burning up, but I have looked to the serpent of brass, and I have been healed.

And so it is with the healing of the Cross. The child of God who has been healed by looking upon the Cross knows what that healing involves. The poison of sin had affected his will, so that it was turned against God. It had vitiated his attitude so that where there should have been reverence and love, there was fear and hate, both toward God and toward men; it darkened his understanding so that he knew not God in His holiness and love nor understood his proper relation to his fellow men. The healing of the Cross has changed all this if it was a healing at all. It set the will in the direction of God's commandments; it set his heart to love of God and man; it enlightened the mind to the knowledge of the living God and the beauty of holiness. How, then, can anyone say he is healed if the evidences of the healing are not apparent in his life? We are saved by grace, to be sure, entirely by grace, but that salvation is a living and a vital thing. It is the healing of the living soul, and a living soul that is healed must live a healthy life. The man whose understanding is still altogether darkened, whose heart is still completely dominated by fear and hatred of God, or indifference to Him, whose will still tends toward evil unchecked, cries in vain that he has looked to the Cross, in other words, that he is a Christian. He has not looked to the Cross, for if He had, healing

would have come, and it would have evidenced itself in a changed life. Justification and sanctification stand in as close a relation as the vitality of the renewed body of the Israelite stood to the look of faith on the serpent of brass, which brought that vitality.

"Almighty and most merciful God, who hast given Thy Son to die for our sins and to obtain forgiveness and redemption for us through His own blood, let the merit of this spotless sacrifice, we beseech Thee, purge our consciences from dead works, that we may serve Thee, the living God, and receive the promise of eternal inheritance in Christ Jesus, our Lord, to whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be honor and glory, world without end. Amen."

SUGGESTED OUTLINE

Introduction: Since Jesus selects the serpent of brass as a type of the Cross in a statement (John 3:14-15) which makes the Cross the way of life, the details of the story of the serpent of brass will furnish instructive and comforting truths on the theme "Life Through Christ."

Theme: Life Through Christ

1. Through Him by grace

As the serpent of brass was God's work and only His.

2. Through Him by faith

As the Israelite was healed by looking to the serpent and only by looking.

3. Through Him alone

There was no recourse for the Israelite but the serpent of brass.

4. Through Him always

The serpent, as the Cross, represents the inexhaustible mercy of God, always available.

5. But *Life* through Him

As the healing of the Israelite meant a living, active body, so the healing of the Cross means a living and active soul.

WALTER O. SPECKHARD

BRIEF STUDIES

CHRIST'S DEATH THE END OF OUR DYING *

Death rules man with tyrannical power. Death obtained this tyrannical power because of sin (Rom. 5:12), and behind sin stands the demanding and condemning power of the Law (v. 13). As Luther pointed out in the theses against the antinomian Agricola, these three tyrants, Death—Sin—Law, always march hand in hand. The tyrannizing and terrorizing power of these tyrants becomes most evident in the power of death. To understand the dreadful power of death, it is necessary to understand the true nature of death. Man's death is not—and that is the dreadful fact—a death in the usual concept of this term, but an eternally ongoing process, an eternal *dying*. In the light of God's Law—God's condemning and convicting declaration—human existence is, as Luther states in his exposition of the 90th Psalm, a life constantly surrounded by death. In reality human existence is not a march from birth to an ever higher form of life; it is not a constant progress ever upward and onward. It is a journey from birth to death; it is a constant dying. Death is not a termination, an end; it is a *dying* death, a condition where "their worm dieth not, and their fire is not extinguished" (Mark 9:46). True, we speak of our physical existence as life. But viewed in the light of God's Law the term "life" is actually a misnomer and a lie. Life as the natural man experiences it is an eternal dying. Death is therefore infinitely more than the temporal end of a temporal existence, more than a mere transition or change from one form of existence to another. In its true nature and in its real meaning under the Law, death is the absolute and complete perversion of eternal life. Because of sin and because of the divine Law which stands behind sin, man's death is the eternal separation from God, the Source and Author of life, from Him who is Life. Death is the state in which man cannot live and cannot die. And the climax of the dreadful of this eternal dying lies in this, that man is solely and entirely responsible for this eternal dying, and at the same time is utterly incapable of freeing himself from the self-imposed guilt and power of an eternal dying.

In all human history only one death has occurred which was death

* This study was suggested in part by Heinrich Vogel, *Christologie*, I, Muenchen, 1949, pp. 272—295. A review of this volume is planned for an early issue of this journal.

in the true and full sense of the word. Christ's death was not a *dying*; it was *death*, a killing, a destroying, an annihilating death. In His death, Christ became a plague unto death and a pestilence unto hell (Hosea 13:14, which Luther rendered: "Tod, ich will dir ein Gift sein. Hoelle, ich will dir eine Pestilenz sein"). Our Savior's life was not like ours in one significant point. Our life is spent in the sign of that dreadful lie which pretends to be life when in reality it is nothing but dying. Christ was not, as we are, surrounded by death in the midst of life. He was at all times the Lord of life, of His life. But as the Lord of life He enters the realm of death. He is forsaken by God. As the eternal Son of God and as true man in one person, He, the God-Man, assumed our death. For He was made to be sin for us and thereby assumed the curse that was ours.

In His death, Christ not only revealed the true nature of death, but at the same time swallowed up death in victory (Is. 25:8; Heb. 2:14; 2 Tim. 1:10; 1 Cor. 15:55). His death is the antidote against our dying, and the only antidote. Christ not only died our death, but He killed our death. It is the glorious work of our Redeemer that He has completely, once and for all, without any reservations whatsoever, revealed in His death the true nature of death and at the same time has once and for all destroyed death. Being separated from God in the mystery of His person, an experience which no man can describe adequately and which, as Luther states, only the damned in hell realize, Christ has restored us to life. In the indissoluble union of Calvary and the Empty Tomb we find the complete annihilation of death. There Law and Gospel have met in such a paradox that the Law is completely destroyed. Death and life have been engaged in a mortal battle in which life and immortality have been brought to light.

The death of Christ as Gospel is unspeakably rich in its significance for us. Christ has destroyed the spiritual dying in which man is held captive by nature. In the midst of death the believer is now surrounded by life. He has arisen to a new spiritual life, the very antithesis of the eternal dying. Through faith the believer has now the conquering death of Christ as his very own possession. Commenting on Rom. 6:3, Luther in his Lectures on Romans in 1515/16 states:

That [our burial with Christ] is in the true sense of the word the meaning of death. In every other death there somehow remains mingled an element of living. This is not the case in Christ's death, where life has appeared in its perfect purity, since His life is life eternal. Only to the death of Christ can be ascribed all the characteristics of death in a true and complete sense, and only in His death.

And everything that dies in this death perishes totally and disappears into an eternal nothingness (*in nihil sempiternum perit*), and nothing whatsoever of it shall ever return, because Christ's death in truth kills and destroys even eternal death. Thus not only sin dies, but also the sinner when he is justified, for sin shall not return into all eternity, as the Apostle says: "Christ dieth henceforth no more." (John Ficker, *Die Scholien*, p. 153.)

The Christian shares the death of Christ, not merely as a dying, but as a destroying death. He is no longer separate from God, nor can God ever forsake him. The Christian's life is now the new life in Christ, completely free from the triad of tyrants: Sin — Law — Death. This is the ground of our hope and the source of our new life in Christ. In and through Christ's death, which we make our own fully and completely, we have died to the Law and its condemning voice; we have died to the old man and his evil lusts, and, having passed through death, we are alive in Christ and to Christ.

The death of Christ as mortifying and destroying death is the key to the Savior's mysterious words spoken to Martha: "Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John 11:26). It is indeed difficult to believe that our mortal frame, bearing the germ of death constantly, has already conquered death. But the Savior's words are more than a figure of speech; they proclaim the solemn and glorious truth: In the midst of death we are surrounded by life. Only he can appreciate these words who, like Luther, sees the significance of the Savior's work as applying to the total person consisting of body and soul and who has completely freed himself from the dualistic view of man so prevalent in the Early Church and in certain sections of Christianity today.* Because of Christ's vicarious death — the only real death that ever occurred — we must look upon our bodies as grains of seed which experience such a process as will bring forth new fruit. Then our dying actually becomes a gain (Phil. 1:21), and the death of God's children is counted precious in God's sight (Ps. 116:15).

But this is not merely a future bliss. Through faith it is also a present reality. In a continuous "now" every believer shares the death and life of His Savior from the moment of his Baptism in infancy, through childhood, adolescence, manhood, until old age. On every level of his life the Christian will ask: Who shall deliver me from this dying? and shall always receive the answer: In Christ you have already the complete victory over your dying. For this reason eschatology is more than a

* See William H. Baar, "Luther's Sacramental Thought," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, November, 1950, pp. 414—425, especially 417 f.

mere appendix to Christian dogmatics; it permeates it at every point; it is the glorious "already—not yet" of the Christian faith.

Without the death of Christ the existence of the soul would be an eternal dying, an eternal separation from God, an eternal existence under the verdict of God's Law. This state is so dreadful that the natural man is ready to accept Satan's delusion that the soul will be completely annihilated. Man, however, cannot escape the eternal dying by denying it, but solely by finding in Christ's death the antidote to his dying. The new life begun at the moment of the believer's justification is an eternal living, an eternal victory through and with Christ over all our tyrants. This is indeed victorious living now and forever.

F. E. MAYER

NOTES ON THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF ITALY

"Whenever the Pope steps on the porch of his Vatican Palace on Monte Vaticano to bless the faithful, he is bound to see on Monte Pincio the stately tower and the impressive red-tiled roof of the Lutheran church in Rome." So our guide told us last summer. We could see the Lutheran church even from the Piazza di San Pietro, and we were proud of it. Monte Pincio lies east of Monte Vaticano.

At Christ's time Monte Pincio or Mons Pincius bore the special name of *collis hortorum*, the garden hill, for here were the famous *horti Luculli* and the equally celebrated *horti Salusti*. When about thirty years ago the builders dug down into Monte Pincio to erect, in Via Toscana, No. 7, the Lutheran church, parish house, and parsonage, they brought to light beautiful pieces of stone from the villa of the author Sallust, who here lived in "luxurious retirement," writing his famous *Catilinarian War* and his *Jugurthine War*. He died in 34 B. C.

As a farewell gift Dean Erich Dahlgruen presented to the writer two eminently interesting books: *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Gemeinde in Rom. 1819 bis 1928*, by Dr. Ernst Schubert, and *Resurrectis! Die Geschichte des protestantischen Friedhofs in Rom*, by Gottfried Niemeier.

At Neuendettelsau, Bavaria, Rev. Zoltan Antony, pastor of the Lutheran parish of Naples, gave to the writer a series of valuable notes on the Lutheran Church in Italy and on its important refugee work in southern Italy. Pastor Antony attended the Missouri Synod-VELKD Theological Conference in Loehle's town and was a most interested listener and enthusiastic student. It is his intention to come to America and attend our Seminary for a year, finishing his thesis for the doctor's title in theology.

From the three sources just mentioned the following notes on the

Evangelical Lutheran Church of Italy, which Pastor Antony usually represents by the letters ELKI, are taken. In the *News Bulletin of the Lutheran World Federation* (Vol. 9, No. 9; Sept. 1, 1950) the Lutheran Church in Italy is called "The Lutheran Church of Italy and Trieste," but we shall use the name given to it by Pastor Antony. In Italy also the name "The United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Italy" was used.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Italy grew out of the small and scattered groups of evangelical worshipers connected with the German embassies in that country. At first evangelical worship could be conducted only within the buildings of the German legation. It was only through ceaseless negotiation and downright hard fighting with the Roman *Curia* that property for evangelical church worship could be procured. Today the Lutheran congregation at Rome owns a beautiful and spacious church property, the gift of hundreds of loyal Lutherans. Fortunately the church, parish house, and parsonage could be completed before the devastating First World War broke out. In Rome the Lutherans own also a large and imposing Deaconess House in Via Alessandro Farnese (No. 18), not far removed from the heart of the Eternal City and the Roman *sanctum sanctorum*, *San Pietro in Vaticano*.

It was still more difficult for the Lutheran groups in Rome to secure a fitting cemetery for the burial of their dead. The story of the famous "Protestant Cemetery," as it is usually called, shows to what pains Rome will go to prevent evangelical Christians from obtaining recognition and protection even after death wherever it is in power. It was only due to the united diplomacy and strategy of Germany and England that at last the victory was won.

So finally, on the Monte Testaccio, the ancient Mons Testaceus, the "Mountain of Potsherds," near the now famous "Pyramid of Caius Cestius," who died before 12 B. C. and who for his tomb had adopted the Egyptian pyramidal form, a small plot of ground, originally a picnic place for poor people and a cow pasture, was yielded to the evangelical Christians as a burying ground for their dead. But there was to be no display of mourning, and the dead were to be buried at night; and there was to be no wall protecting the graves and the tombs against dogs, hoodlums, and the inciting wrath of inimical priests. Even Alexander von Humboldt pleaded in vain to have the graves of his two sons, buried there, protected against those who could see no reason whatever why the graves of evangelicals merit respect.

Today this retired spot, secured by a strong wall, is a place of beauty, quiet, and rest. Of the famous men here laid to rest, we mention only the English poets Keats and Shelley, and the son of

Goe
We
agai
urbs
whi
geli
O
and
exis
held
evan
lega
on
were
by
his
of E
of C
devo
kisse
fello
were
to c
nary
mad
"Ka
atten
A
foll
Nap
Gen
sina,
A
194
then
espe
Luth
Both
sum
in It
trina
Chur

Goethe, who died in Rome after a relatively short and unfruitful life. We offer these details to give the reader a little of the background against which evangelical Christendom had to assert itself in the *urbs papae*. Many famous evangelicals living in Rome turned Catholic, while others, such as Goethe, never showed any interest in the evangelical movement in Italy.

Of the Lutheran congregations in Italy, those in Rome, Florence, and Naples are the oldest, for in a more or less organized form they existed for more than a century. The first Reformation Festival was held in Rome on October 31 and November 1, 1817. There was no evangelical pastor present, but Bunsen, the secretary of the German legation, in whose house the festivity took place, read a fitting address on the meaning of the Reformation, and suitable Scripture passages were read and prayers spoken. The Reformation Festival was attended by many famous persons, among them Alexander von Humboldt and his learned wife, the German ambassador Niebuhr, Professor Brandis of Bonn, and Kestner, the secretary of the Hanoverian legation, a son of Goethe's Lotte. In the conclusion of a letter to his sister, the devoutly loyal Bunsen writes: "At the close of the service, Niebuhr kissed me, and all the attendants were deeply impressed. Our Catholic fellow Germans, who are our best friends, were amazed. The Italians were enraged. I hope that in 1917 our grandchildren will be able to celebrate the Reformation Festival in Rome in a church." Preliminary arrangements for this Reformation Festival, by the way, were made by faithful Bunsen and his friends in the ancient German "Kaffeehaus," the Café Greco, in Via Condotti, which also Goethe attended and which is still in existence.

At present there are Lutheran congregations with pastors in the following cities: Rome, Genoa, Milan, Meran, Bozen, Trieste, and Naples. Churches without resident pastors are extant in Venice, Genoa Nervi, Rapallo, San Remo, Bordighera, Florence, Capri, Messina, Catania, and Palermo.

At the Synod of Florence, which took place from October 13 to 16, 1949, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Italy was reorganized. Since then it has become more and more conscious of its Lutheran heritage, especially as it has become more closely connected with the United Lutheran Church of Germany and the Lutheran World Federation. Both Pastor Antony and Dean Dahlgruen assured the writer this past summer that in the future the work must be done more and more in Italian and that suitable textbooks must be prepared for the indoctrination of young and old, especially for winning for the Lutheran Church some of the many churchless in Italy.

The confessional basis of the ELKI is the Augsburg Confession, and all who subscribe to it may join the Church, no matter what race they are, Germans, English, Scandinavians, and so forth. The newly organized Church as yet has many problems of doctrine and practice, but the writer was assured that efforts are being made toward greater confessionalism and a more Scriptural and Lutheran church practice.

At the head of the ELKI is Dean Erich Dahlgren, No. 7, Via Toscana, Roma, whose functions are very similar to those of the general president of our own Church. The writer was told that the president proper must be a layman to satisfy the peculiar church laws of Italy. The ELKI at present has about 5,000 members. Its chief tasks are the witnessing of the Gospel, the care of souls, the reorganization of the existing congregations, the refugee mission, and the newly begun youth work.

The pastor of the Naples parish must first of all take care of the local congregation, which consists of about 250 souls. In addition, he must supply with services the scattered groups in southern Italy and on the Island of Capri, a parish that numbers about 500 souls. To his charge is entrusted also the refugee mission in the vicinity of Naples, which means the care of 300 and more souls. To him finally has been assigned the youth work in the whole Church, which means caring for more than 400 young people.

In addition to this work, there are to be organized new congregations in such cities as Bari, Syracuse, and Taormina. Lutherans living on the Island of Tschia requested Lutheran services when Pastor Antony was in Neuendettelsau. There are many other opportunities, and the work is urgent, while the laborers are few. Youth work has only begun. In Cerro, on famous Lago Maggiore, a Lutheran youth camp last summer brought together 45 young Lutherans from all parts of Italy. These young Lutherans are eager to know more about their Church and to serve it in a more abundant way. So this work must be carried on more intensively.

Pastor Antony writes: "After June 30, 1951, I intend to come to America to finish my treatise on 'Das Katechumenat bei Gerhard von Zezschwitz.' I would be thankful if the American vicar could come to Naples as soon as possible, in order that he might be inducted into his work. All that which we do in Italy in the name of Jesus, we do to His glory." The address of Pastor Antony is Rev. Zoltan Antony, Portici, Napoli, Via E. Gianturco 43.

The American Lutheran Church, by the way, has lent to the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Italy a student vicar for two years. The

undersigned met him at the theological conference at Bad Harzburg, and he proved himself a most interesting reporter on Italian church affairs.

In a special descriptive article on the refugee and diaspora work, Pastor Antony writes by way of conclusion: "On the second day of Christmas (1949) a Christmas service was held on Capri, that gloriously beautiful island in the Gulf of Naples. The blue sea, the rugged rocks, the enchanting summer homes, the green gardens, the blossoming flowers, and, above all, the azure-blue sky of Italy with its bright sun formed a gorgeous setting for our celebration. Also here the glad tidings of Christmas were proclaimed, and at the end of the service all joined in singing the Christmas anthem 'O du froehliche, o du selige, gnadenbringende Weihnachtszeit. . .'"

To Capri aging, cynical Tiberius withdrew to "enjoy seclusion" and "disgusting debauchery." Under Tiberius, as everyone knows, Christ died. Of Tiberius, and his life and work, witness only the splendidly ghastly ruins in Rome and on Capri, while to the everliving, triumphant Christ thousands of faithful believers are singing anthems of praise and glory—"O du froehliche, O du selige, gnadenbringende Weihnachtszeit. . ."

J. T. MUELLER

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

THE NCCCUSA

The ecumenical movement in American Protestantism, one of the most significant trends in Christendom in the first half of the present century, reached its climax on November 29 when there came into being, in Cleveland, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Whatever one's personal reaction may be to the nature of this venture and however dubious one may be regarding its future, the fact remains that in Cleveland 25 Protestant and 4 Eastern Orthodox groups, representing a total membership of more than 31,000,000, joined hands for co-operative efforts in the areas of home and foreign missions, of Christian education, and of Christian life and work.

Merged in the new Council are agencies which for decades operated independently, chief among them being the Federal Council of Churches, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Home Missions Council, the International Council of Religious Education, the Missionary Education Movement, the National Protestant Council on Higher Education, the United Council of Church Women, and the United Stewardship Council.

The functions of the Council as outlined in the "Inaugural Message of the National Council" and approved on December 1 by the General Assembly, are the following:

The Council assists in the preparation of materials for the church school, and through its scholars is making ready for the world the Revised Standard Version of the Bible; it serves as a clearinghouse for full reports and statistics bearing upon church membership, denominational organizations and programs, and social trends of interest to Christians; it seeks to aid the churches in undergirding and co-ordinating their home and foreign missions; it searches out and trains leaders for Christian undertakings; it lifts up its voice in behalf of the Christian way of life in messages to the people of the country; it provides a single inclusive agency through which, if they wish, the denominations may nominate and support chaplains and ministers to the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States; it offers a means of approach to agencies governmental and civil in matters of justice and good will; it devotes itself to the presentation of Christian ideals through radio, television, and motion pictures; it is an organ of evangelism both specifically and broadly conceived, standing ready to serve the cause of Christ in every area as need arises, to the end that the

entire country may be permeated by the blessings of the Gospel. Through these and other means it gives help to the churches, bringing the experience of all to the service of each.

On the other hand, the "Inaugural Message" assures American Christians that "the Council is not a denomination, not a church above the churches. The autonomy of each communion is assured by constitutional provision. The Council is an agency of co-operation — not more but magnificently not less." In similar language, *The Living Church* (Episcopal) editorializes (Dec. 10):

The NCCCUSA is not a super-Church, a United Church, or any kind of Church at all. It has no power to deal with doctrinal questions and no governing authority over its constituent bodies. It cannot dictate to the Episcopal Church, or to any other communion, in any way whatever. It has no control over the General Convention or the National Council of our own Church, or over similar organs of other members. . . . The constitution of the NCCCUSA specifically provides that the Council shall have no authority or administrative control over the Churches which constitute its membership. Specifically, it is declared that it shall have no authority to prescribe a common creed, or form of church government, or form of worship, or to limit the autonomy of the Churches co-operating in it.

From the sheaf of reports and newspaper clippings on the Cleveland convention it appears that the new Council is the result of careful planning, which reaches back almost twenty years. The agencies enumerated above had to agree to sacrifice some of their sovereignty in order to fit into the larger and more inclusive framework. Furthermore, the denominations represented in the Council had first to get the approval of their bodies. An endless mass of detail had to be attended to. The releases to the press suggest that external pomp and pageantry was not lacking. The "Oeffentlichkeitswille," as German visitors to our shores call the American eagerness to make the headlines, was mightily evident. One is impressed also by the large number of executives and staff workers which the Council will employ. "A hasty estimate indicates that the NCCCUSA will employ the services of somewhere between 800 and 1,000 persons — clergy and laity, men and women, with a fair sprinkling of youth representatives. In addition, there will be the employed staff, but we are not yet able to offer even an approximate figure as to its size. If the employed staff of the hundreds of state and local councils of churches are included, the total will be large" (*The Christian Century*, Dec. 13). If money speaks, then the total budget for 1951, which exceeds \$4,000,000, is impressive.

Of the Lutheran bodies in our country, the Augustana Lutheran

Church, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church of America became charter members of the Council. Disregarding the other Lutheran bodies in our country which did not join the Council, *Life* (Dec. 25) comments on a picture showing the delegation leaders: "Of all major U.S. Protestant denominations, only Southern Baptists and Missouri Synod Lutherans did not join the Council."

"Where there is much light, there is also much shadow," is an old saying. What are some of the shadows of the Cleveland convention? We note the following:

1. In the mass of materials on the convention we fail to discover even a semblance of that theological earnestness which characterized the convention of the World Council of Churches held in Amsterdam in 1948. In the addresses and reports one finds a farrago of religious sentiments and high and noble ideals, but precious little solid theological thought. As was to be expected, there was a complete crossing of denominational lines in the divine services.

2. According to the "Inaugural Message," the Council will shape "its policies in the light of the aims of the United Nations." What does this mean? We read in the literature before us that the Council is patterned after the United Nations Organization. Are we to assume now that the NCCCUSA is to become the religious arm of the U.N.?

3. We are optimistic enough to believe that the new Council will, in course of time, "shake down" and make it possible for the average mind to understand the complex organizational structure of the new organization and the manner in which it hopes to co-operate with boards, committees, and commissions of the churches which constitute its membership. But we are not the only ones who already see difficulties ahead. *The Living Church* (Dec. 10) reminds its readers (and we share its concern):

We want to take this opportunity, at the outset of the NCCCUSA, to caution it against invading the rights of its member churches to exercise missionary jurisdiction and control, at home or abroad. One of the things that caused the Episcopal Church to hesitate so long about joining the Federal Council of Churches was its sponsorship of a "United Church" in the Panama Canal Zone, in direct rivalry to the long-established work of the Episcopal Church in its missionary district of the Canal Zone. The Episcopal Church cannot permit the funds that it contributes to this co-operative agency to be used to undermine its own work, or to set up a rival jurisdiction. If that were done, the NCCCUSA would instantly forfeit the support of a con-

siderable body of Churchmen. We know that Lutherans and members of other centrally-organized communions share our convictions in this respect.

Indeed, one cannot escape similar concern with regard to other areas of church work which the Council will promote, in particular the areas of foreign missions and Christian education.

In conclusion: What happened at Cleveland was more than the establishment of a National Council. What happened was the establishment of an organization which is super not only to the agencies merged in it, but super also to the denominations represented in it. This is the road that will lead either to gradual centralization of power in the Council or to endless strife between the Council and the Christian bodies constituting it. One hesitates to predict for the Council what is happening to the U.N., since, after all, Christian men and women are heading the Council. Yet, even Christian men and women in high and responsible positions have always found it difficult to renounce completely the drive and urge for power and ultimate supremacy. But this is not the way in which God establishes His kingdom in the hearts of men nor is it the way in which oneness in Christ is achieved.

P. M. B.

MINISTERIAL ENROLLMENT AT LUTHERAN SEMINARIES

The *Lutheran Outlook*, December issue, submits the following statistics on enrollment at Lutheran theological seminaries:

Seminary	Affiliation	Enrollment	Change
Concordia (St. Louis)	MO	495	+51
Concordia (Springfield, Ill.)	MO	385	+48
Luther	ELC	347	+75
Augustana	AUG	206	+57
Capital	ALC	161	+26
Philadelphia	ULCA	136	+33
Wartburg	ALC	133	+ 7
Gettysburg	ULCA	130	+24
Chicago	ULCA	88	+17
Northwestern	ULCA	87	+15
Hamma	ULCA	80	+ 5
Thiensville	WIS	57	
Southern	ULCA	45	+ 3
Augsburg	LFC	38	+14
Central	ULCA	33	+12
Saskatoon	ULCA	27	+ 2
Saskatoon	ELC	26	— 1
Suomi	FINN	20	+ 1
Trinity	UELC	18	+ 3
Waterloo	ULCA	12	
Grand View	DELC	5	— 1
Total		2,529	391

The editor states that there seems to be a corollary between the number of students and the growth of a church body. The American Lutheran Conference has a total of 929 students, an increase of 181. The five Conference bodies had a total increase in 1949 of 86,215 baptized members. The ULCA seminaries have 638 students enrolled, an increase of 111. This Church gained 32,747 baptized members. The Missouri Synod, with a total enrollment of 880 resident students, representing an increase of 99 students, gained 60,149 baptized members. The Thiensville Seminary records no change in student enrollment. The increase of membership in the Wisconsin Synod during 1949 was 2,386 baptized members.

The editor concludes: "It would seem that the church bodies which build up their seminaries are the church bodies which grow most rapidly. Or is it just a coincidence that the more rapidly growing bodies also have the larger number of ministerial graduates?" It certainly is true that interest in missions generally keeps pace with interest in the training of workers for the Church. The above table does not reflect the enrollment of college students at the teachers' colleges of the Missouri Synod, a total of 772. And yet the training of our teachers and the support of our parochial schools is a tremendous factor in developing the mission spirit and one of the best agencies for doing real mission work where it is needed sorely, namely, on the home and congregational level. The mission-mindedness and the sacrificing spirit of our future teachers came to light in a report by Dr. Albert Huegli, dean of students at Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill. Six Freshmen have turned down a total of \$2,069 in scholarships to other institutions in order to prepare themselves as teachers in the Lutheran elementary school system. Among the 191 entering College Freshmen, nine were salutatorians and ten valedictorians of their respective high schools, and forty-four are members of various honor societies.

F. E. M.

ALL GERMAN LUTHERAN FREE CHURCHES IN FELLOWSHIP

On October 1, 1950, the Renitente Kirche der U. A. C. in Nieder-Hessen, founded by A. F. C. Vilmar in 1873, united with the Unabh ngige Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in Baden, Hessen und Niedersachsen. As a result there are now only four Lutheran Free Churches in Germany: The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Old Prussia (Breslau Synod), the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Germany (the Saxon Synod), the Independent Evangelical Lutheran Church of Baden, Hessen, and Niedersachsen, and the recently established Evangelical Lutheran Refugee Mission (organized by pastors of the former Polish

Evangelical Lutheran Church, in membership with the Wisconsin Synod). More important still is the fact that within a period of five short years these Lutherans have reached a God-pleasing unity.

F. E. M.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF WEIMAR-LUTHER EDITION

The *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (September 30, 1950) reports that the Bishops' Conference of the VELKD decided in its recent meeting to pledge the support of the VELKD in the completion of the Weimar Edition of Luther's works. In reporting this resolution, R. Jauernig presents a historical sketch of the genesis of the Weimar Edition.

The first to suggest and to put into action the scholarly edition of Luther's works was J. K. F. Knaake (1835—1905). As early as 1818, Knaake conceived the plan of editing a scientific edition of Luther's works, because the Frankfurt-Erlanger Edition was inadequate. Julius Koestlin encouraged Knaake in this undertaking by supporting Knaake's request to the Prussian State Minister for a subsidy. On September 22, 1880, Knaake submitted his plan, according to which Luther's complete works were to be published in 36 to 40 volumes *Grossoktav*, each volume comprising forty-five to fifty *Bogen*. After some discussion the Prussian State promised to support the work with an annual subsidy of 4,000 M. for ten years. Knaake promised to have the first volume ready in 1883. It is interesting to note that among the original subscribers of the WA, listed in the first volume, there are kings, grand dukes, dukes, eminent professors, churches, including also the library of Concordia Seminary at St. Louis.

Knaake insisted that the writings of Luther should be published in their original form, including also spelling mistakes and patently false punctuation. More important still was his principle that Luther's works were to appear in a strictly chronological order, so that the student could obtain — in the words of the Preface — "a deeper insight into Luther's spiritual being and work, all the various phases of his activities as preacher, teacher, and reformer." It soon became apparent that Knaake could not carry on the work of editing and publishing Luther's works alone. The materials were too voluminous, and the combined efforts of many scholars were required to issue a really critical study of Luther's writings. This becomes quite evident as one examines Volume 35, dealing with Luther's hymns, on which a number of scholars labored for seventeen years. At first a commission composed of two theologians and two German philologists was appointed to assist Knaake in his

work. In 1882 Julius Koestlin was added to the commission, and since that time the ratio of theologians and philologists was three to two. In the course of almost seventy years many outstanding scholars have participated in this tremendous undertaking. In addition to Knaake and Koestlin such men as Otto Clemen, George Buchwald, and E. Kroker must be mentioned, and especially the publisher, Hermann Boehlau and his successors.

The original plan to follow a strictly chronological sequence could not be carried through consistently, particularly because research uncovered some previously unknown manuscripts. This was true especially of the lectures on Romans delivered by Luther in 1515/16, of which Joachim Ficker published photostatic copies in 1908. This significant find is embodied in Volume 56 of the WA. The original plan was amplified so that the WA is divided into four sections: 1. *Die Werke*; 2. *Table Talks*; 3. *The German Bible*; 4. *Luther's Correspondence*. *Die Werke*—Luther's exegetical, doctrinal, polemical, homiletical, catechetical, and miscellaneous writings—are contained in Volumes 1—54, 56, 57, and 58 containing the Index. However, it must be kept in mind that Volumes 17, 31, 34, 39, each have two sections; Volumes 10, 30, and 40, three sections. A total of sixty-nine volumes comprises *Die Werke*. The *Table Talks* fill six volumes and were prepared chiefly by E. Kroker. Luther's correspondence is contained in eleven volumes, prepared chiefly by Otto Clemen. The plan now calls for twelve volumes dealing with all the material on the German Bible; eight of these have already been published. To date ninety-four volumes have appeared, sixty-nine devoted to *Die Werke*, six to the *Table Talks*, eleven to the *Correspondence*, and eight to the *Bible*.

Concordia Seminary has two sets of this scientific and scholarly edition of Luther's works. In this day of a reawakening of interest in Luther's theology it is highly desirable that our young theologians make a thorough study of Luther's theology on the basis of his own "*theologische Werdegang*." Pritzlaff Library of Concordia Seminary hopes to become increasingly a depository for Lutherana and thereby to attract students who wish to specialize in the field of Luther research.

F. E. M.

MORE PROTESTANT MISSION WORK IN NORTHERN AFRICA

In a recent issue the *Christian Century* directed the attention of its readers to the fact that Northern Africa, from Cairo to Casablanca, constitutes an indisputably promising area for more extensive and intensive mission work by Protestant denominations. The mission call of this wide-awake periodical, frequently showing unusual insight

and foresight, should not go unheeded. Every student of church history remembers what the narrow fringe of land, north of the Sahara, used to mean for the Christian Church. In the city of Bone, derived from the Latin *bona*, *sc.*, Villa Bona, so-called because of its excellent site and climate, there still is a sort of suburb, called Hippone, where once stood Hippo Rhegius. There in A.D. 399 and 419 St. Augustine directed church councils to determine the canon of the New Testament. Tunis is practically identical with Carthage, where in 397 the Third Council of Carthage was held, at which all the present books of the New Testament were accepted. Bone is still a large city, with a Roman Catholic cathedral, while Tunis is gaining in importance as a commercial and political center from year to year. In Casablanca many refugees, as we were told last summer, are seeking new homes, and mission work, other than Mohammedan, seems to be badly needed.

In the *Sunday School Times* (November 11, 1950) Dr. Robert Brown has published a most interesting article on North Africa as mission field for Protestant denominations with a definitely Christian theology to combat the errors of Islam and to win converts for Christianity. The climate of this fringe of land, by the way, is Mediterranean, "somewhat like that of California though perhaps not quite so good." Dr. Brown has been a missionary in Tunisia for twelve years and knows the country and people well enough to speak with authority. The work, of course, is not easy. Dr. Brown writes, to quote only a little: "We see [in North Africa] that politically there is an over-all situation that is threatening if not alarming. The magic word *hurria*, 'independence,' is on every North African's lips. In the background is the belligerent figure of Abd-el-Krim, the avowed enemy of France, demanding immediate independence for the whole of North Africa with the threat of five million armed men if it is not granted." — "Yet recently," he goes on to say, "despite a hostile atmosphere, two new stations have been opened in Morocco. . . . Perhaps the most significant and encouraging sign for those interested in the evangelization of North Africa is the readiness to take and read the Scriptures, the most powerful antidote to the poison of Islam, the surest way of bringing light into darkened souls. In Libya, the Bible seller disposes of cases of Bibles, New Testaments, and Gospels in a few days to people who are hungry for God's Word. In Tunisia, Bible sales are unprecedented, and throughout North Africa it is the same story. The old dogmatic Islam cannot withstand the progress of knowledge and science. Materialism is powerless to fill the spiritual void, and the new agnostic Moslem is at least more ready to read than ever before."

This may sound as if Dr. Brown were overoptimistic. But he is not. In the article, which is far too long to be quoted in full, he earnestly intercedes for the prayers of all believers not only for doors to be opened, but also "that doors that are now open shall be kept open." He calls attention also to the costliness of mission work among Mohammedans. "Work among the Moslems has indeed been costly, so costly that many have asked us, 'To what purpose is this waste?'" Nevertheless, he writes: "Yet here and there, scattered across North Africa, there have been jewels won for His crown. There was B—, won for Christ from a fanatical and noble Moslem family. Then we have just heard of a little group of converted Moslems who gather for fellowship week by week in a remote village of Tunisia, everyone led into the light by the testimony of a convert. In Kabilia there is another, who built and decorated in Arab fashion his own preaching hall. In Morocco we are at last seeing the emergence of Christian homes and children brought up to know the Word of God. Conferences in Algeria and Morocco annually gather well over a hundred converts and missionaries. . . ."

Dr. Brown closes his report with the words: "We need men; we need transport; we need modern equipment. But above all we need a volume of continuous prayer. Moslems pray five times a day in the name of a dead prophet to one who is cold and unfeeling. Let us pray in the name which is above every name so that at last in this day Abraham's heartfelt prayer might be answered and that Ishmael might live before Him."

Just what can we do to answer the mission challenges that come to us both directly and indirectly? Our new mission work among the Mohammedans in India was started by a group of Christians who were willing to contribute toward wider mission responsibilities over and above the regular budget sums, special offerings to reach beyond that which we are able to do as a Church. In Germany, England, France, and other countries of Europe, interested mission societies have for centuries done what their churches were unable or unwilling to do. Here in America we have mission-minded congregations in non-Lutheran denominations that support from two to more than a dozen missionaries in special fields of interest. One thing is certain: we must find new ways to save while unloosed Satan is daily searching out new ways to destroy. And the average believer is more mission-minded than we are inclined to think. We still have not tapped the resources in our Church for greater missionary work at home and abroad.

J. T. MUELLER

"JESUITISCHE FESTUNG AMERIKA"

The Jesuits have drawn a complete ring of universities, colleges, and high schools around our country, and many in the interior. Here are cities having Jesuit secondary schools: Portland, Me.; Boston, Worcester, Lenox, Mass.; Fairfield, Conn.; New York, Buffalo, Syracuse, N. Y.; Jersey City, N. J.; Scranton, Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Garrett Park, Md.; Detroit, Mich.; Cleveland, Ohio; Tampa, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; New Orleans, Shreveport, La.; Dallas, Tex.; Los Angeles, San Jose, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Tacoma, Yakima, Wash. Cities with Jesuit schools of higher learning are: Washington, D. C., Cincinnati, Ohio, St. Louis, Mo., Chicago, Ill., Milwaukee, Prairie Du Chien, Wis., Omaha, Nebr., Kansas City, Mo., Denver, Colo. Nor is this the end, for Jesuitism is planning yet more universities, colleges, and high schools. Jesuit education, however, is only a part of the Roman Catholic educational program. There are many Roman Catholic universities, colleges, and high schools that are outside the Jesuit order. This sketch of the *Jesuitische Festung Amerika* should startle the Missouri Synod Lutheran who contemplates that his Church has only one university, a few high schools, and not too many parish schools.

J. T. MUELLER

GERMAN LUTHERAN BISHOPS DENOUNCE ROME'S NEW DOGMA

The repercussions caused by the proclamation of Mary's assumption are much greater in Germany than in our country. Here the general public remained virtually indifferent to the action taken by the man on the Tiber. The Christian people see in the new dogma the necessary sequel to the two previous dogmas published in 1854 and in 1870. American Lutherans, generally speaking, believe that the proclamation of this new dogma is only another symptom of the Antichristian character which Rome has so patently manifested in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. American Lutherans realize that in 1563, with the conclusion of the Council of Trent, Rome has officially forfeited its claim to catholicity, because in the Council of Trent it established the Roman Church as a sect by formally cutting itself off from the *Christian* tradition of the preceding centuries. In Germany, however, the new dogma caused great consternation, as is evident in the Lutheran Bishops' pastoral letter on this issue. There are probably two chief reasons for the totally different reactions in Germany and in America to the most recent evidence of the Antichristian character of the papal system.

In the first place, in many territories of Germany the Evangelical and the Roman Churches have worked side by side, each leaving the other very much alone. As an example, we might mention the arrangement

at the Tuebingen University, where the Evangelical and Catholic theological faculties are housed in the same building and jointly use some of the University's facilities.

The second and the chief reason is the phenomenon that Rome has several theological "faces," and in Germany it reveals a different "face" than in other parts of the world. Since the war cordial and fraternal discussions have been carried on between Evangelical and Catholic pastors, though a papal *Monitum* of 1950 actually proscribes this. Many Evangelical clergymen entertained the hope that German Catholic theologians would become actual "partners" in theological discussions. In our contacts with German Evangelical pastors we had occasion repeatedly to warn against such false hopes. Nevertheless the fact remains that in many sections of Germany the Roman Catholic clergymen are more "evangelical" than anywhere else in the world. The German Catholic clergy study the Bible and follow Lutheran dogmatics quite closely. A prominent Catholic scholar told us that he has Pieper-Mueller Dogmatics in his library. Therefore the German Lutheran clergyman finds it quite difficult to understand how a Roman theologian can speak "evangelically" — as many German Catholic theologians do — and yet unconditionally submit to the new dogma. By philosophical and theological arguments "evangelical" Roman theologians endeavor to make the new dogma theologically meaningful (cp. my article "Mary's Assumption, a Symptom," March, 1950, issue of this journal). A recently advanced argument runs as follows: God does not *force* any of His gifts on mankind. Therefore man's redemption requires not only God's activity, but also man's willingness to accept it. Christ represents God's activity, and Mary by her willingness to become the mother of God represents the whole human race in its willingness to accept God's redemptive work. For this reason Mary must share in all of Christ's works, including the bodily assumption, not as the initiator, but as the willing recipient. A rather specious argument is contained in the following rhetorical question: "Is it not much more pious to maintain both Christ's and Mary's assumption than to deny both, as so many of the liberal Protestant theologians do?"

In the light of this situation in Germany we can understand the difference in the approach of German and American Lutherans to the new dogma. One can also appreciate the deep concern of the Evangelical bishops in publishing the following pastoral letter, which was received a few days ago from Bishop Meiser's office.

1. The dogma of Mary's bodily assumption has no basis whatsoever in the Scriptures and contradicts the clear testimony concerning the

sequential relation of the resurrection of believers to that of Christ (1 Cor. 15:23 f.).

Scripture testifies that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was placed into the service of God in a unique way, so that as a virgin she gave birth to the Son of God. For that reason it is correct when the ancient church fathers speak of her as the mother of God, and in this respect she occupies a singular position in the human race.

But Scripture also shows us that Mary, as all other mortals, was unable to understand the work of Jesus and that His entire life was for her not only a sorrow, but also an offense. After the death and resurrection of Jesus she undoubtedly belonged to the Apostolic congregation, however, merely as a member. The Scriptures give no evidence whatever that the congregation honored her with special respect. If Mary is elevated through the anti-Biblical claim that by her immaculate conception and her assumption she was actually removed from the rest of humanity, elevated above all saints and angels, and was even made co-mediatrix and co-redemptrix next to Christ, then the Biblical picture of the mother of Jesus is completely destroyed.

By establishing a dogma that the body of Mary has already been assumed into glory, man anticipates what God has reserved for the end of time; yes, still more, Mary receives honor and rank which is similar to that of Christ and separates her from the rest of the Christian Church.

Also in the post-Apostolic testimonies there is no reference to Mary's assumption. Approximately 400 years after Christ the following legend appears: The Apostles were gathered about Mary's death-bed when Jesus approached with His angels, received her soul and committed it to the Archangel Michael. When the Apostles wanted to bury her on the next day, Jesus appeared for the second time and removed her body in a cloud into Paradise, where her body and soul were united.

Although responsible teachers of the Church have declared this legend as spurious, folk piety, nurtured in part by pagan traditions, established the festival in honor of Mary's alleged assumption. However, as late as 1568, a Roman breviary states that the Church does not know what happened to Mary's body. By elevating the legend of Mary's assumption to an article of faith and by making its acceptance necessary for salvation, the Pope has departed radically from Rome's historic position on traditions. Rome held that only that is truly Catholic which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. The Pope has disavowed this completely.

3. Universal Christendom is confronted for the first time with the fact that the Pope, on the basis of the infallibility decree of 1870, decrees an article of faith. The opposition which was voiced by all

Christian denominations in 1870 against the infallibility decree, and which led to the defection of the Old Catholic Church, is now justified in a most terrifying manner through the Pope's new dogma. This dogma is not, as many other old dogmas of the Roman Church, an erroneous interpretation of the Apostolic doctrine. It has absolutely no foundation in the message of the Apostles and is therefore in principle the Pope's refusal to be obedient to the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Although Roman Catholic theology endeavors to distinguish between the adoration given to Mary and the worship given to the Trinity, folk piety will unavoidably be led to a gross transgression of the First Commandment. The motto: "Via Mary to Christ," obscures the way which God has revealed for man's salvation.

4. The declaration of the new dogma fills us with grief as we view the relation of the Christian churches to one another. The common warfare in these apocalyptic times against diabolical forces had drawn the various Christian Churches to one another in such a way that they were ready to listen to one another and to learn of one another. This reapproachment was predicated on the assumption that the testimony of the Apostles is the only basis for Christian doctrine. But through its decree the Roman Church has irrevocably forsaken this foundation. We note with deep grief the consequences which this denial of the foundations of the Church must bring about.

5. In this hour again we testify to our congregations that our salvation rests solely and alone in Christ, the crucified and risen Lord. We abide by the word of our Lord: "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven" (John 3:13). We call upon our congregations to testify by word and deed that we need no other mediator than our Lord Jesus Christ, since

On Christ's ascension I now build
The hope of mine ascension.

F. E. M.

ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

In 1949 the Sunday school enrollment in the 243,454 Sunday or Sabbath schools totaled 28,893,789 and marked an increase of 7.03 per cent over the previous year.

The Luther League of America, the official youth organization of the U. L. C. A., has approved a summer youth caravan program to increase its present enrollment from 30,000 to 80,000 members. Young people ranging in age from 18 to 24 will be sent out on tours in caravans of five or six to present programs and speeches on behalf of the League at Lutheran church conventions, at the meetings of youth groups in

churches and summer camps. In announcing the caravan program the Rev. F. Leslie Conrad said: "We will attempt to give our Lutheran young people the opportunity to find the faith to go with these troubled times through a program that accepts the changes brought about by the A-bomb and the H-bomb, just as the youths have already accepted them."

The World Council of Churches has selected St. Paulus Lutheran Church of the American Lutheran Church as one of five churches for a study of "the evangelization of modern man in mass society." Located within six blocks of the big stockyards and meat-packing plants in St. Paul, Minn., the World Council's study committee believes that this parish offers an opportunity to survey and evaluate special techniques that are being used successfully to reach industrial populations with the Gospel and to pass on these techniques in special articles to other churches in industrial areas.

The Order of St. Luke, a national liturgical brotherhood of Methodist ministers, held its third annual convocation in Chicago. Features of the sessions were talks by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillebrand of the Catholic Liturgical Conference and Mar Eshai Shimm XXIII, Catholicos patriarch of the Church of the East. The program was devoted to "magnifying the place of the sacrament" in Methodism and encouraging wider loyalty to Methodist ritual and use of the book of worship.

Members of the Philadelphia Friends General Meeting re-emphasized the ministry of silence at their recent annual session and insisted that it was as vital today as when the sect was founded almost 300 years ago. They believe, however, that their silent worship should be complemented by a vocal ministry and called upon one another to offer both a "prepared" and a "spontaneous" type of vocal ministry. Their historian, Horace Mather Lippincott, said: "It is the minister and not the sermon that needs to be prepared."

In 1944 the Hillel Foundation at the University of Minnesota set up a \$300 scholarship which is awarded annually to a Jewish student for the greatest contribution in promoting interfaith relationships on the campus. This year the scholarship has been set aside to perpetuate the memory of King Gustav V of Sweden for his work in rescuing thousands of Jews from Nazi-dominated countries early in World War II.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference presented a building program of \$250,000,000 in the next five years for the expansion and modernization of Catholic schools in the United States.

The fourteen oldest Philadelphia Protestant churches—all founded between 1677 and 1796—joined to help Temple Radeph Shalom, the city's second oldest synagogue, to celebrate its 150th anniversary. The churches represented at the anniversary celebration, in order of historical precedence, were Gloria Dei Episcopal, the Early Meeting of Friends, Germantown Mennonites, Christ Episcopal, First Baptist, First Presbyterian, Old First Reformed, First Moravian, St. Michael's, Zion Lutheran, St. Peter's Episcopal, First United Presbyterian, St. George's Methodist, Old Pine Street Presbyterian, and First Unitarian.

In the course of a United Nations Security Council debate Jacob A. Malik said: "We all know that missionaries have always been a weapon of aggression and that they have served to promote the conquests of the ruling circles and to enslave peoples who were a source of income. . . . "Missionaries have always been followed by traders and soldiers."

The question of ordaining women to the ministry is receiving wide discussion in Finland at present because a Swedish parliamentary committee is about to present a majority report favoring the reform. Finnish women's organizations in towns and cities have won many supporters for the ordination of women, but in both Finland and Sweden country people, who make up the majority of the population, are against the innovation.

ALEX WM. C. GUEBERT

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

HEBREW-ENGLISH LEXICON, Containing All the Hebrew and Chaldee Words in the Old Testament Scriptures, with Their Meanings in English. Samuel Bagster & Sons Ltd., 80 Wigmore Street, London, 1794. Harper and Brothers, New York. 287 pages, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.50.

This is a useful little lexicon for handy reference. "The lexicon is specially designed to put into the hands of the English student, in a compressed and compendious form, the contributions of modern philology to the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures" (p. v).

Since this work presents the 27th edition, it is not a newcomer in this area of research. The reason for this new edition is given thus in the Preface: "The best modern authorities have been consulted in this preparation of the present work; and we have endeavored to give the results of their researches in as condensed and convenient a form for reference as possible" (p. iii).

WALTER R. ROEHRS

A STUDY OF THE PROPHET MICAH. "Power by the Spirit." By B. A. Copass and E. L. Carlson. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1950. 169 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.00.

Monographs on the Minor Prophets have appeared in mild profusion in recent years. Some have treated all of these twelve Old Testament books, e. g., *The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets*, Raymond Calkins, 1946; some deal with several of these Prophets, e. g., *Meet Amos and Hosea*, Roland E. Wolfe, 1945, or *Two Hebrew Prophets: Studies in Hosea and Ezekiel*, H. Wheeler Robinson, 1948; or a whole volume is devoted to a single Prophet, e. g., *Prophet Without Portfolio: Studies from Amos*, P. C. Jones, 1949.

The present volume dedicates 169 pages to a study of the Prophet Micah. The first chapter (pp. 13—41) presents a history of the development of prophecy in the ancient world and in Israel from the time of Balaam down through "the schools of the prophets," to the men of God whose messages are retained in our prophetic canon. This section unfortunately has the savor of the evolution of religion: "From magic and the casting of lots to the remarkable spiritual penetration of the Prophets of Micah's period is a long way; and men had been able to traverse it only because through moral intelligence and spiritual honesty they had worked under God's guidance" (p. 22). Chapter II (pp. 43—77) gives the reader the historical background, political, social, economic, of Micah's message. In Chapter III

(pp. 79—94) the person of the Prophet receives attention. The remainder of the book explains the message of Micah. The exposition is sound and scholarly.

Not too technical for Sunday school and Bible class teachers, "it is designed as a textbook for use in a survey course in the Old Testament, or for a more intensive course in Old Testament prophecy."

This book represents the joint endeavor of two professors of Southwestern Baptist Seminary. After the manuscript had been prepared, one of the authors, B. A. Copass, passed to his eternal reward. He had served Southwestern Seminary since 1918. The co-author, E. L. Carlson, is the successor of Copass.

WALTER R. ROEHRS

BIBLE COMMENTARY. By James Comper Gray and George M. Adams (formerly published as *Biblical Encyclopedia* and *Biblical Museum*). Five volumes, 6½ × 10. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. \$4.95 a volume; the whole set, \$23.95.

A Bible commentary which many theologians consider a great Christian classic is here given to the world in a new printing. Its contents are correctly described in the terms "expository notes, usable sermon outlines, effective illustrations." The five volumes, which vary in size from 760 to 1008 pages, treat the following books respectively: 1. Genesis—Second Kings; 2. Chronicles—Proverbs; 3. Ecclesiastes—Malachi; 4. Matthew—Acts; 5. Romans—Revelation. Each Biblical book is prefaced by an introduction and a synopsis. The commentary is unique in that on the individual passages excerpts from the writings of famous Bible scholars are submitted. Among those quoted are Augustine, Baxter, Brooks, Calvin, Clark, Edersheim, Farrar, Henry, Luther, Maclaren, Meyer, Moody, Spurgeon, Talmage, Wesley. Naturally, at times statements are made which the reader will find unacceptable, the theological positions of the men quoted varying greatly. Looking at the notes on some passages, I find the commentary quite helpful. Some samples will serve my purpose better than mere assertion. On Gen. 4:1 the comment on the word "Lord" reads: "Lit., I have gotten a man, the Jehovah. They perhaps thought this man child was the promised Seed, the destined Deliverer." On Mark 4:31 f. these words are cited from Thompson *The Land and the Book*: "We are not to suppose that the mustard seed is the least of all seeds in the world; but it is the smallest which the husbandman was accustomed to sow; and the 'tree,' when full grown, was larger than the other herbs in his garden. To press the *literal* meaning of the terms any further would be a violation of one of the plainest canons of interpretation. This ample size, with branches shooting out in all directions, yet springing from the very smallest beginning, contains, as I suppose, the special meaning and intention of the parable." The pastor will find this work a great aid in preparing for sermons and Bible class discussions.

W. ARNDT

THE JEW AND PALESTINE IN PROPHECY. By M. R. De Haan, M.D.
Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 183 pages,
5½×8. Price, \$2.00.

It is with melancholy feelings that one reads this book. The author is a former physician, who now devotes his time and energy to Bible teaching, serving as radio Bible class instructor on the full Mutual Network and a number of independent stations, whose voice is heard not only in this country but in Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, South America, Cuba, the West Indies, and Africa. Reading the addresses which constitute this book, all dealing with the general topic of Bible prophecies pertaining to Israel and their fulfillment, one cannot escape the conviction that the author is an ardent disciple of Jesus and a staunch defender of the divine character of our Scriptures. While this makes us rejoice, one is saddened by the bald chiliastic literalism with which the Bible prophecies are interpreted. To the author what is taking place now in Palestine is the fulfillment of what Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the other Old Testament prophecies foretold long before the coming of Christ when they spoke of the glories that would envelop Palestine in the Messianic age. To give the point of view of the author, the following sentences from p. 53 may be quoted: "I have often been asked why I did not make a trip to the land of Palestine, and have been invited to join parties for a trip to the Holy Land. I have never desired to go at all at this time. My Bible tells me all I need to know about the land during these days of Israel's dispersion. Moreover, I am going to the Holy Land some day anyway, and without any expense, absolutely free, for when Jesus returns to earth, all believers will be with Him, and He will come directly to Canaan in Judea before Jerusalem. I can afford to wait until I make that trip of all trips with the Messiah as my Leader and Guide." How one wishes that the author would give more serious consideration to the word of Jesus "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36) and to the words of Paul "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17). Whoever wishes to inform himself on the precise views of Pre-millennialism can hardly do better than order this book.

W. ARNDT

PROBLEME ALTCHRISTLICHER ANTHROPOLOGIE. Biblische Anthropologie und philosophische Psychologie bei den Kirchenvätern des dritten Jahrhunderts. "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," 44. Band, 2. Heft. Von Heinrich Karpp. 256 pages, 6½×9½. C. Bertelsmann Verlag, Gütersloh, 1950.

One of the most important problems in the history of Christian thought is the influence of philosophical ideas upon the development of theology. And one of the most important areas for a consideration of this influence is the history of the Christian doctrine of man, specifically the process

by which the Greek doctrine of the rational and immortal soul intruded itself upon Christian anthropology and became an accepted element of many Christian dogmatic systems.

The crux of this development is the thought of St. Augustine, as Erich Dinkler's *Die Anthropologie Augustins* (Stuttgart, 1934) has shown. But a reading of patristic theology before Augustine shows that almost all the significant theologians of the first three centuries addressed themselves to this question. The present volume, originally composed as a dissertation, is an attempt to fill in some of the pre-Augustinian background on the history of Christian speculation about the origin of the soul.

Operating by hindsight from later discussions of the soul, Karpp divides the main body of his book into three sections — traducianism (pp. 41—91), creationism (pp. 92—185), and the theory of pre-existence (pp. 186—229). This presentation is preceded by a brief examination of the relevant Biblical and classical materials, and followed by a survey of the development up to and including Augustine. The author thus seeks to set the Church Fathers he examines — Tertullian as traducianist, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, and Arnobius as creationists, and Origen as teaching the pre-existence of the soul — into their historical environment and to assess their respective historical achievements.

On the traducianism of Tertullian, Karpp comes to the conclusion (p. 66) that while Tertullian did not use his theory about the transmission of the soul as a proof for original sin, he did provide later generations with a rationale for explaining how sin is inherited. The differences between Tertullian's viewpoint and that of Clement of Alexandria are not as sharp as most historians make them; "die Unterschiede liegen vor allem in der Abkehr des Klemens vom stoischen Materialismus, in seiner Verwerfung einer angeborenen Verderbnis des Menschen und der damit zusammenhängenden Anschauung, dass der wertvollste Teil der Seele nicht mit fortgepflanzt werde" (p. 130). Karpp sees the psychology of Origen as an attempt to be Biblical, which failed because of Origen's Platonic presuppositions (pp. 223—229).

Viewed as a whole, Karpp's dissertation is a careful, scholarly, and Biblically sensitive piece of theologico-historical research. Like most dissertations, it is sometimes a trifle fastidious in its use of literary materials. Two major omissions occur to this reviewer. In his discussion of the Biblical background, Karpp should perhaps have laid more stress upon the distinctiveness of the Christian doctrine of resurrection in contrast to the Greek view of the soul. And in view of the entire problem and especially of his claim that Gnosticism influenced Tertullian (pp. 64—66), Karpp should perhaps have done more about Gnosticism than merely to refer to the admittedly excellent work of Kaesemann *Leib und Leib Christi* (p. 39).

An examination of Karpp's material convinces one again of the wisdom

with which Lutheranism has declared this entire problem an open question (Pieper, *Dogmatik*, I, p. 105, n. 387). No study of the history of Christian anthropology can afford to ignore what Karpp has discovered and interpreted.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

DIE KIRCHE UND IHRE DOGMENGESCHICHTE. By Werner Elert. Evangelischer Presseverband fuer Bayern in Muenchen. 1950. 22 pages, 6×8½. 0,90 DM.

What is the relation of the history of dogma to the Church? This treatise is Werner Elert's answer to the question. It is at the same time a reply to men like Harnack and Kaehler and, in general, to all who are indifferent to dogma. To Elert, one's attitude with regard to dogma is a criterion of one's membership in the Church. "Because we believe in the inner unity of the Word of God," he says, "we also believe in the inner unity and consistency of the history of dogma, because and in as far as it transpires in dependence on the Word of God." This, he admits, is indeed purely a statement of belief, and whether one can defend it depends on one's viewpoint—it depends on whether one is in the Church or outside of it. Apart from its intrinsic value, this treatise is another manifestation of the growing confessional consciousness in the Lutheran Church of Germany.

L. W. SPITZ

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen, Teacher of Thomas à Kempis. Edited by Albert Hyma. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1950. 116 pages, 3½×5½. \$1.00.

This little treatise is not to be identified with the *Imitatio Christi* by Thomas à Kempis. According to the translator and editor, it was written by Gerard Zerbolt, the teacher of Thomas à Kempis. Later on à Kempis used this treatise and added three chapters, publishing the entire work under the well-known title *Imitatio Christi*. However, the spiritual power of Zerbolt's treatise is lacking in à Kempis' edition. Students who are acquainted with the first chapter of à Kempis' book will recognize the similarity as well as the great dissimilarity between Zerbolt and his famous pupil.

F. E. MAYER

BOOKS OF FAITH AND POWER. By John T. McNeill. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York and London. 183 pages, 5×7½. \$2.00.

This delightful little volume is the result of a series of lectures on the subject "Classics of Western Religion." The eminent author, for many years professor of European Christianity at the University of Chicago and since 1944 occupying the chair of Auburn Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, selected for a creative interpretation the following writings:

Martin Luther: *On Christian Liberty*

John Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*

Richard Hooker: *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*

John Bunyan: *The Pilgrim's Progress*

William Law: *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*

John Wesley's *Journal*

To know the author is to respect his sound scholarship and sincerity of purpose. The present volume may serve two kinds of readers. Some it will acquaint with the authors and their objectives as seen by another; others it will encourage to read the originals. It is quite probable that the author had particularly the second group in mind.

In answer to attempts of W. R. Inge and Peter F. Wiener to link up Luther with Hitler, Dr. McNeill declares: "As one who has given a good deal of attention to the Reformer's political thought, I feel justified in saying that Luther would have abhorred Hitler and all his works" (page 24). He does believe, however, that Luther had an exaggerated respect for the "powers ordained of God" and recognizes as in part a result of this the prevailing submissiveness toward the State which marks the history of German Lutheranism (*ibid.*).

L. W. SPITZ

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS. An American Translation. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York. 321 pages, 5½×8. \$3.75.

Dr. Goodspeed, who himself has written a respectable library during his half century of New Testament and patristic scholarship, here submits a new version of a dozen writings of the Apostolic Fathers in the same lucid and appealing style in which he translated the New Testament some years ago. Prefacing each with a brief introduction dealing with authorship, date, occasion, and purpose, he has the following writings appear in modern English: The Teaching of the Apostles—The *Doctrina*; The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles—The *Didache*; The Letter of Barnabas; The First Letter of Clement—To the Corinthians; The So-called Second Letter of Clement; The Shepherd of Hermas; The Letters of Ignatius; The Letter of Polycarp to the Philippian; The Martyrdom of Polycarp; The Apology of Quadratus; The Fragments of Papias; The Address to Diognetus. In the appendix Dr. Goodspeed shows the place of the *Doctrina* in early Christian literature. The esteemed author merits the sincere gratitude of all students of patristics and the history of dogma.

L. W. SPITZ

MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS. By Arthur T. Pierson. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 2 volumes, 152 and 128 pages, respectively, 5×7½. \$3.00 per set.

This is another addition to the publishers' library of reprint classics. The author needs no introduction, since he has been known as a faithful

apologist for more than two generations. The reader will enjoy the nineteenth-century flavor of his apologetics. If he were to write today, he might substitute several present-day illustrations in place of some that he used, though basically he would have to make but few changes. The truth which he defends is the same today as it was at the time of his writing, but in the light of recent scientific discoveries he could defend it even more successfully than he did. To appreciate his defense of divine truth, it is not necessary to agree with all of his exegesis nor with all of his doctrine. In Volume I he discusses prophecy and fulfillment, the possibility and probability of miracles, the Bible's witness to itself, its scientific accuracy and truth, and its moral beauty and sublimity. In Volume II he portrays the power and beauty of Christ.

L. W. SPITZ

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Henry Clarence Thiessen, B.D., Ph.D., D.D. Formerly Chairman of the Faculty of the Graduate School, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1949. 574 pages, 5¾×9. \$6.00.

A spot-checking of this volume convinced the reviewer that this dogmatics is not worth the price to a Lutheran theologian. The author leans very heavily on Reformed theologians, quotes freely from Hodge, Shedd, and especially A. H. Strong and injects a moderate Arminianism and Premillennialism of the dispensational type. Lutheran pastors who wish to study Reformed dogmatics will use such standard works as those of Hodge, Warfield, or the more recent publications of Berkhoff and Boettner.

F. E. MAYER

GREAT PULPIT MASTERS. Volume V, J. H. Jowett. Volume VI, F. B. Meyer. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, c. 1950. \$2.25 each.

This splendid series continues with volumes of sermons by John Henry Jowett, a British Congregational minister who served 1911—1918 in the Fifth Avenue Church of New York City and died in England in 1923; and B. F. Meyer, a British Baptist evangelist who is supposed to have preached more than 16,000 sermons in a life that extended beyond the fourscore. The Jowett volume contains twenty-seven addresses and an introduction by Professor Elmer G. Homrighausen; the Meyer volume, twenty-two addresses and a very brief inspirational foreword by Dr. Robert G. Lee. The two volumes are in most interesting contrast. Jowett proceeds by a route of simple meditation, while his style is opulent and fanciful. Meyer speaks much more simply, enjoys careful analyses of his texts, yet brings inventiveness and resourcefulness to bear upon his treatment. Pastors who are ready to apply the correctives of an ample Biblical theology will enjoy the stimulus of these volumes.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON THE MUSIC OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH. By Walter E. Buszin. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis. 32 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. 25 cents.

This reprint of a paper originally prepared under the auspices of Valparaiso University carefully develops its theme. Professor Buszin's documentation is so complete that it will serve also applications to other areas of the Christian life. The author recommends wider employment of the literature for organ and choir that has been prepared under the impulse of the doctrine of the royal priesthood—literature which stimulates to congregational participation and which reflects the essential facts of sin and grace.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

BACH—THE MUSICAL APOSTLE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH. Luther A. Schuessler. Published by Redeemer Lutheran Church, 6430 Harvard Ave., Chicago 21, Ill. 16 pages, $4\frac{3}{8} \times 6\frac{5}{8}$.

An address and eulogy, written by one of our pastors and published by his congregation, which sings the praises of Bach in loud, exalted strains. It is encouraging to see not only the youth, but also the clergy of our Church become enthusiastic about an important segment of the great musico-cultural heritage of the Lutheran Church. This is encouraging also when, as in the present case and in a spirit of upright modesty, members of the clergy thus engaged assert no claims of being musical experts of some kind. They thus help keep alive within our midst Martin Luther's spirit of appreciation for good music.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

THE TRIAL AND DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST. By James Stalker. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 185 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. \$2.00.

James Stalker, 1848—1927, a graduate of Edinburgh University, served for many years as a pastor in the Free Church of Scotland. His book has the subtitle *A Devotional Study of Christ's Passion*. Each of its 23 chapters offers much excellent sermon material. The author is well read, and it is refreshing indeed to find many references to scholarly works and to the original Greek version of the New Testament Scriptures. While the cautious reader will not be ready to subscribe to a remark like: "—a prayer for forgiveness cannot be answered without the *co-operation* of those prayed for" (p. 117), the book is, on the whole, quite sound theologically and points to the redemptive work of Christ as man's only hope for salvation. The author says: "Theology has its center in the cross. Sometimes, indeed, it has been shy of it, and has divagated from it in wide circles; but, as soon as it becomes profound and humble again, it always returns" (p. 140). Pastor Stalker does not approve of an undue display of emotionalism in the Lenten meditation; in his Preface he calls attention to the fact that the Gospels themselves offer an incomparable model when they let it suffice to present a faithful exhibition of the facts themselves. The

great defect of the book is that the author often discusses persons and circumstances so much in detail and with such care that the study is not as Christ-centered as it should be and the work of Atonement suffers lack of stress and emphasis. This applies even to his discussion of Calvary (Chapter XII), where, while describing the Savior's thirst, he devotes an entire page to a discussion of the use of stimulants and intoxicants; far less space is devoted in this chapter to the meaning and efficacy of what happened on Calvary's cross and to the comfort we may derive therefrom. Such excursions have an insidious way of leading us away from the real message of the Cross and too often appeal to our old Adam, who is not so naive and innocent at such times as we like to think. The Scriptures are very profound when they refer to "the foolishness of preaching" (1 Cor. 1:21), and to preach the unadulterated Gospel of Jesus Christ in season and out of season is one of the most difficult and challenging tasks of the Christian ministry of the Word. Pastor Stalker, whose book we recommend, indicates that he is aware of this fact in his *The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS. By Robert G. Foster. The Macmillan Company, New York. Revised Edition, 316 pages, 5¼ × 8. \$2.75.

This guidebook to marital happiness is addressed specifically to young people to help them face and successfully cope with the vexing conditions, problems, and circumstances of the present new era, though it is recognized that there is no perfect solution for these. Most problems are of such a nature that we must work them out for ourselves. In four major sections the author from the personal rather than the sociological viewpoint introduces the reader to premarital and postmarital experiences together with a consideration of the mutual interaction of family life, social and economic influence. The field is well covered, and there is also a frank, yet chaste discussion of sexual matters. As usual, the approach is not Christian. The author considers marriage a human institution, and whatever importance attaches to religion, applies to religion generally, not specifically Christianity. Seven helpful appendices are attached.

O. E. SOHN

FROM LUTHER TO KIERKEGAARD. A Study in the History of Theology. By Jaroslav Pelikan. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1950. 171 pages. \$2.75.

At last the book has appeared for which the student of Scripture, of Lutheran theology, and of philosophy has ardently hoped many a year. And, fortunately, it is a book, too, which will compel the respect and gratitude of students interested only in the history of Christian dogma or in the history of religious thought in general.

The peculiar value of this book is fourfold: 1. It traces the history of

Lutheran theology not merely to the closing years of High Orthodoxy, but all the way down to the critical period following Hegel. 2. It honestly faces up to the question of the relation of philosophy to Lutheran theology and frankly confesses that philosophy, if only on its formal side, has a way of intruding into every systematic formulation of Lutheran theology. 3. It exposes the basic fallacies in eminent systems of philosophy which, though they are indebted to the Lutheran tradition, nevertheless fail to meet the demands of the Christian faith. 4. It makes a plea for an articulation of a Christian philosophy consonant with the deepest convictions of the Christian faith as enunciated by Luther.

In only 120 pages the author develops the interrelations of Lutheran theology and philosophy from Luther to Kierkegaard. But into these chapters titled "Luther," "Melancthon and the Confessional Generation," "The Age of Orthodoxy," "Rationalism," and "The Nineteenth Century" he packs a mass of information which, together with the 45 pages of notes in the back of the book, make this volume a *Quelle* for further research. The pages fairly drip with data and give evidence of the author's wide and penetrating acquaintance with Luther, Lutheran theology, and the currents of thought which dominated the past four centuries.

In the plethora of religious and philosophic books published in 1950, Dr. Pelikan's is one of the few which to this reviewer proved to be genuinely relevant and eminently useful. The book is further evidence that Luther and Lutheran theology are very much alive in our day—also in our Church. Finally, the book is one of the "best dressed" in Concordia's 1950 array of ensembles. To both author and publisher our warm congratulations!

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY. By Arthur Vööbus, Dr. Theol. Published by the author. Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary Book Store, Maywood, Ill., 1950. 98 pages, paper cover. \$1.20.

The author is at present a professor at Chicago Lutheran Seminary at Maywood, Ill., but was formerly professor of theology at the University of Tartu, Estonia, and in the Baltic University (in exile) at Hamburg-Pinneberg, Germany. He is one of the thousands of refugees driven out of their ancient ancestral homes by our recent partner and friend, the "freedom-loving" Communist Russia.

In the first part of the book, Professor Vööbus gives a graphic eyewitness account of the horrors experienced by himself and his people and by millions of others who suffered a similar fate when they fell helpless victims to Communist Russia. The picture he draws is horrifying. On this side of hell nothing more terrible is conceivable than the horrors and tortures endured by these our helpless fellow Lutherans in the decade through which we have just passed, and the end is not yet.

One cannot imagine the depth of depravity to which a human being can

sink until one reads this account of human perversion and of the fiendish tortures invented and inflicted by these modern savages of atheistic Communism; but it demonstrates again that once man denies God and repudiates his own moral responsibility, he becomes a devil incarnate and takes on the very image of Satan himself.

In the second part of the book the author deals with "the failure of Protestant theologians in their understanding of communism." "Most Protestant theologians," he writes, "have failed to demonstrate an ability realistically to criticize or to resist the noisy, confident propaganda of the Communist. What Protestant theologians have said or written about Communism constitutes a chapter in contemporary literature, the study of which makes sick and weary anyone who has confronted the Communists in actual fact." On the other hand, he adds: "An objective study which considers the facts and realities cannot conceal that the honor of making articulate the responsibility for mankind in this perilous hour, and the distinction of having had the courage to raise its voice against the enemy, belongs to the Roman Catholic Church" (page 63).

The author is bitterly disappointed about the position taken by the Amsterdam Conference, of which he says: "The condemnation of Communism in the Amsterdam Report is only an apparent one because, in my opinion, Communism was actually honored and promoted most excellently when it was bracketed with capitalism! Amsterdam only increased the chaotic situation and helped to confuse unsuspecting people about the real phase of Communism. It misled the people in the Western World by giving currency to the false idea that in Communism there is the same kind of danger as in capitalism."

In the last chapter the author presents "the tasks of the Church in the present situation" as he visualizes them. He writes:

"Concerning the question what the Church must do, we cannot give an answer before we have an analysis of our present-day situation. What are the factors which must be taken into account? There are several of them.

"The first is guilt. This, like a dreadful burden, weighs upon the powers, groups, and interests which co-operated with Communism. Under the banner of democracy Communism has been brought into the heart of Europe. Politicians and circles that had no scruples and no ethics, delivered many nations and countries to Communism at Teheran and Yalta. They have caused misery, sufferings, and tragedy to many nations which have seen the best part of themselves sent Eastward, to be lost forever. . . . We can take it for granted that this reality of guilt is working. The free nations have not emerged from the influence of this destructive policy. It has lulled to sleep and destroyed a part of the conscience of free nations and poisoned the spirit. Moreover, the signs of an overture to judgment are very clear. Everyone who has followed closely the incredible mistakes of politicians must have perceived clear symptoms that the abandonment of God's law leads along paths whose end is blindness and the dark.

Operations in the political field, bereft of direction and conviction, grope in darkness. We mention only some examples: erroneous understanding of the plans and perils of Communism; belief that real agreement between the free nations and Communism is possible; the assertion that Chinese Communism is not an increase of the power of Russian Communism; an abandonment of China and its deliverance to Communism; the continuing shipment of war materials into Russia; the incredible mistakes being made in Germany (the Morgenthau plan!); a generally wrong attitude toward Spain, etc. Indeed, everyone who has followed closely the utterly childish activities of the politicians, must draw the conclusion that here is going on a self-destruction of huge dimensions."

Dr. Vööbus has rendered a great service to the people, and particularly to the churches of the Western World, telling us in a language that cannot be misunderstood what Communism is and into what desperate situation the world has plunged itself by aiding this godless power. The book is an earnest plea for repentance. It makes one humble, but it is also an earnest warning that we read the signs of the time before it is too late and the darkness of godless Communism descends on the rest of the Western World.—But read this book, read it again, have your people read it. Every American should read it.

A. M. REHWINKEL

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Association Press, New York, N. Y.:

STORIES OF CHRISTIAN LIVING. Edited by J. Edward Lantz. 293 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.50.

From Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, N. Y.:

THE PULPIT TREASURY OF WIT AND HUMOR. By Israel H. Weisfeld. 182 pages, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. \$2.50.

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

IDEAS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE'S PARTIES. By Morry Carlson and Ken Anderson. 77 pages, $3\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$. \$.60.

GOD'S MAN IN MANHATTAN. The Biography of William Ward Ayer. By Mel Larson. 168 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.00.

FORTY YEARS IN THE AFRICAN BUSH. By Josephine C. Bulifant. 185 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. \$2.00.

CHILD'S TREASURE BOOK OF FIRESIDE TALES. By Ken Anderson. 109 pages, $6\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$. \$1.50.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF ROBERT MURRAY M'CHEYNE. By Andrew A. Bonar. 185 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.00.

VIEW

rope
ding
ween
nese
; an
uing
made
ward
dish
bing

larly
nnot
tion
s an
nest
the
tern
it.
L

ges,

eld.

Ken

rer.

85

09

A.